

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL
Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library

Accn. No. 6157

Date..... 26.2.75

call
~~Shelf List~~ No. 052 ORI | A

Vol. 14 (Pt. 2)

THE BRITISH
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. IV.

LONDON:
JACKSON & WALFORD, 18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD;
AND
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT.
EDINBURGH: W. OLIPHANT AND SONS.
GLASGOW: J. MACLEHOSE.—DUBLIN: J. ROBERTSON.

CONTENTS OF N^o VIII.

ART.	PAGE
I. The Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Sir James Macintosh	285
II. The Covenanters in the North of Scotland: or Sketches of the Rise and Progress, north of the Grampians, of the great Religious and Social Movement, of which the Covenant of 1638 was the symbol. By Robert King	325
III. 1. The New Timon. A Romance of London.	
2. Poems. By Leigh Hunt. Poems. By John Keats. Songs and Poems. By Barry Cornwall	350
IV. Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. C. J. Hefele	378
V. 1. Contributions to the Mathematics of Phrenology. By James Straton.	
2. The Brain and its Physiology; a Critical Disquisition on the Methods of Determining the Relations between the Structure and Functions of the Encephalon. By Daniel Noble, M.R.C.S.	397
VI. The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets, translated from the original Hebrew; with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. By F. Henderson, D.D.	419
VII. 1. Illustrations of the Croton Aqueduct. By F. B. Tower.	
2. Metropolitan Sewage Manure. Report of Parliamentary Committee	427

ART.	PAGE
VIII. 1. Education Inquiry. Abstract of the Answers and Returns made pursuant to an Address of the House of Commons, dated May, 1833.	
2. Reports of the Manchester Statistical Society.	
3. Minutes of the Committee of Council. 1841, 1844, 1845.	
4. Reports of the Inspectors of Factories. 1845.	
5. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D.	
6. Some Remarks on Dr. Hook's Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's. By one of the Clergy of the Manufacturing District and parish of Manchester.	
7. Report of an Educational Tour in Germany, and parts of Great Britain and Ireland, being part of the Seventh Annual Report of Horace Mann, Esq., Secretary of the Board of Education.	
8. Equity without Compromise; or Hints for the Construction of a Just System of Education, (second edition,) with Remarks on Dr. Hook's Pamphlet, and the Letters of Edward Baines, Esq., to Lord John Russell. By Edward Swaine, Member of the Congregational Board of Education	444
IX. Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, from the years 1834 to 1845, inclusive	509
<hr/>	
CRITICISMS ON BOOKS	541

Notterpan Public Library
Accession No. 6143 Date 24.2.34

12 PRI
1.4 (P.2)



THE BRITISH

QUARTERLY REVIEW

NOVEMBER 1, 1846.

ART. I. *The Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Sir JAMES MACINTOSH.* In three volumes. Longman and Co. London : 1846.

SIR JAMES MACINTOSH, the author of the work before us, was distinguished, even during his lifetime, not only as an author, but as a lawyer and a politician. In all these departments his character and attainments were highly rated. His intellect was not only acute and active, but extensive and versatile. That this character of mind is often dangerous to an author's best fame is an undoubted truth; but it adds the interest, which variety never fails to give, to his collected works; and if he fails to reach the highest pinnacle, it is tolerably certain of securing for him a secondary place in public estimation. This charm, be its ultimate value what it may, the writings of Sir James Macintosh unquestionably possess. They may be divided—and are divided by the editor of the present volumes—into three classes. One portion is purely and strictly philosophical. Another comes more properly under the division of general literature. A third portion may be, with propriety, styled political. Under the first-mentioned head of pure philosophy must be placed the admirable dissertations on ethical science, and on the characters of Bacon and Locke. Under the head of general literature we must class the *Life of Sir Thomas More*; the discussion as to the real authorship of the famous 'Icon Basilike'; the beautiful treatises on the causes of the Revolution of 1688, and the partition of Poland, together with various minor articles published in the 'Edinburgh Review' and elsewhere. Under the category of

politics we should set down the once famous, though now partly forgotten 'Vindiciæ Gallicæ,' the character of Canning, and the various speeches delivered by Sir James in the House of Commons. That the works of Macintosh naturally arrange themselves into these three species is unquestionable. We do question, however, whether the editor has done wisely in his adherence to this arrangement in his publication of these writings in their collected form. We, for our own part, decidedly prefer the chronological order. We there see the progress of the author's mind. We behold the young, the bold, and the enthusiastic speculator in philosophy and politics, who derives his knowledge from books and from his own reflective powers, softened down and ameliorate into the experienced thinker, who has read mankind themselves; and who from the great and appalling volume of the world, has at last deduced those more sober conclusions as to human capabilities and human destinies, which books never could supply. It is after this method that we shall adventure to trace and exhibit to our readers the progress of the intellect of this accomplished person and amiable man. With regard to some of the grand subjects of human reflection his mind no doubt underwent little change. There is no evidence to show that on the topics of ethical or generally metaphysical science his opinions, during his later years, were materially different from those which he had formed at an early period of life. But on general political questions, and on the multiform considerations connected with the social institutions of mankind, it is clear that the notions of this acute and candid man did undergo considerable mutations; and these we shall both exhibit and consider. As a portraiture of the first and last conclusions of such a thinker, upon topics of constant and paramount importance, they are both curious and valuable. As instances of candid and philosophical thinking on the part of the writer of these varied works they do honour to his character. If we cannot approve of the whole of them, we can yet honour the candour which impelled Sir James Macintosh to avow them. We know how to estimate the courage which leads some men to sacrifice to the cause of truth all minor considerations; and setting at defiance the vulgar and hollow cry of 'inconsistency,' honestly to avow honest changes of opinion on controverted subjects. On such occasions we hold that bold reliance upon general character, on the part of an individual, ought ever to command more or less of the confidence and respect of his fellow-men: nor ought the sordid treacheries or barefaced tergiversations, which too often disgrace the herd of thinkers and of politicians, to have any other effect than to add to our admiration of those more honourable persons

who have dared suspicion for the sake of truthfulness, and hazarded the imputation of insincerity because they were really and indeed sincere. It is under these impressions that we first turn our attention to the 'Vindiciæ Gallicæ,' one of the earliest and boldest of the compositions of Macintosh.

The 'Vindiciæ Gallicæ' were composed and published in the course of the years 1791 and 1792. The period was the most extraordinary that modern times have beheld. In 1789 had burst forth the great revolution in France, like a volcano in the night, sending its thunders and its flashes far and wide, and rousing men from their sleep. This grand outbreak, the effects of which we are still feeling and shall long continue to feel, in its progress encouraged some and terrified others; but, in its commencement, no doubt startled all. The world had not until then seen the spectacle of a powerful and great nation awaking suddenly, as it were, out of a deathlike trance of corruption and moral and physical decay. The phenomenon was as new as it was imposing; and men knew no more how to anticipate the movements of regenerated France than did the daring creator of Frankenstein those of the monster whom he had made. Uncertainty is the mother of alarm. The few hoped; the many feared; all doubted. It is certainly true that some skilful calculators of questions of finance had, in more than one publication, foretold a probable and fast approaching *bouleversement* of the government and monarchy in France, but these publications were read by few and believed by none. Forebodings, not very dissimilar, as to the ultimate effects of the English national debt, then only one-third of its present amount, had been hazarded and laughed at; and warnings which in England had become ridiculous, were not likely to be seriously regarded when applied to another country. The actors in the scenes of that period were as incapable of foreseeing the extent of English industry and English toil, as they were of anticipating the effects of French impatience when roused from its lethargy to contemplate the dissolution of an effete despotism. Hence, the French Revolution, commenced in 1789, astounded public opinion in Great Britain as intensely as on the Continent. Wonder and alarm were the feelings almost universally excited. The lower classes in this country were then totally destitute of political knowledge of any kind. They received the news with apathy. Amidst the aristocracy, alarm of an extreme description, and to a most unmanly degree, was all but universal. Of the middle classes, some few applauded and hoped. These were the literary and speculative men chiefly. The majority, however, first feared and then hated. The church was loud in its

denunciations of French principles and French freedom of thought and act. The destruction of popery could not reconcile the hierarchy and the universities to the 'demolition of 'divine right' and 'passive obedience' to kings. The dissenters alone saw in the fall of the corrupt Gallic monarchy, and still more corrupt Gallican church, a chance for liberty of conscience, and of an escape for freedom in general from that double chain with which state-churches and state-despotisms had so long conspired to bind the souls and bodies of men. Amongst the very earliest impugnors of the proceedings then going on across the Channel was the justly-celebrated Burke. Up to the period of 1789, he had, though a cautious reformer and timid political thinker, upheld the general right of mankind to a government of rational freedom, and to some safeguard and refuge from the assaults of unprincipled and aggressive arbitrary power. On the attempt to tax the American colonies, against their consent, and without their concurrence by means of being represented in parliament, he had acted the part of a wise and patriotic thinker. Of the greatness of his talents no man doubted. It was hoped that the eloquence as well as the principles of Chatham survived in him. From the very commencement, however, of the changes in France, the whole man seemed to undergo disastrous change in his own person. For the whole of the men who then became prominent in French affairs, and for all their objects and all their acts, he seemed to cherish a bitter, an undistinguishing, and an inextinguishable hatred; and he poured out his exasperated feelings in various publications, eloquent, powerful, and almost irresistible in style, but rambling, unfair, and grossly exaggerative in substance, of which the first and most successful was the volume of 'Reflections on the French Revolution.' Whether Burke really foresaw the extremes to which the Revolution in France was ultimately carried, it is impossible to say. He certainly predicted them; and these predictions, in their effect, as certainly helped to stir up that coalition against the liberties of our neighbours, which was the main cause of their actual fulfilment. Burke's wonderfully artful and eloquent tirades were universally read, and the result was decisive. Almost the whole Whig aristocracy joined the Tory party in urging on the timid and unwilling Pitt to that fatal war which has cost us so dear. Burke went with them. If not their avowed leader, he was their open adviser. Rewards were showered upon him by the Tory government; and George III. became avowedly his patron, saying openly and frequently, that 'every gentleman in England ought to read Mr. Burke's book!' This was decisive. Burke's Reflections

were published during the year of 1790. Early in 1793, England, in concert with Austria and Prussia, was at war with the French republic.

It was in the midst of this terrible conflict of opinion in England, and during a time when the state of this country was almost as accurately described as was that of the neighbouring realm by the emphatic phrase of 'a Reign of Terror,' that Macintosh, then a young man, dared to write and to publish his '*Vindiciæ Gallicæ*,' or 'A Defence of the French Revolution and its English admirers against the accusations of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke.' This work was made public in 1792, and to publish anything, however temperate, however rational, or however in accordance with English maxims of government, but having such a title, was, at this period, an adventure of no little peril. Between rage and dread, the bulk of the nation was in a state not far removed from insanity. All who were supposed to look with an eye of approval upon the scenes across the channel, were denounced from every pulpit in the kingdom, that pulpit being in a church. The very mention of a 'reform' of the abuses of our own institutions, at once became sedition, and was so called in parliament and out of it. The speeches from the throne, the orators in both houses, and the journals in general, treated as a traitor every man who dared to talk of freedom or of any amelioration of defective institutions; and the attorney-general of the day (Sir John Scott, soon after Lord Eldon) was busied in preparing legal machinery for the destruction of all such. To dare to compose and to put forth such a work as Macintosh then did, ought to confer a lasting honour on his name. The very attempt, however executed, argued an intrepidity of character rarely met with. The execution of the work itself argued much more. In this powerfully written and soundly logical treatise, Macintosh boldly undertook to establish, 1. The necessity for a great change in France; 2. The legal character of the national assembly; 3. The inevitable nature of much of the excess and outrage that ensued; 4. The moderation of the provisions of the new constitution then set up; 5. A complete justification for those in England who approved of them generally. Such was the plan of the '*Vindiciæ Gallicæ*.' That it is excellent in outline few will be now disposed to deny. The execution was, perhaps, somewhat inferior to the design; but it was such as to ensure success for the work, and fame for its author. To compare its style with that of the writings which it attacks would be unjust. Macintosh unquestionably had not the mastery of words, the vivid fancy, the keen sarcasm, the withering and lofty scorn, the measured eloquence, and antithetic pointing of sentences the

most beautiful, which distinguished his great antagonist. But notwithstanding his inferiority in these splendid requisites to victorious writing, the grapple was no unsuccessful one. He brought to the field an honest and dauntless enthusiasm; a style elegant and correct, and often keen and trenchant; a large stock of legal and constitutional lore; the calm temper of a practical logician; and last, but not least, the 'vantage' of a good cause. The consequence of the publication was a decided reaction in public opinion in favour of those who dared to hold that mankind have *rights* as well as *duties*; and that, notwithstanding the most arrogant and insolent of aphorisms by the most arrogant of prelates, the people *ought* to have something 'to do with the laws' beyond 'obeying them!' To the declaimers against the excesses and other evils which arose out of the struggle in France, environed as she then was by foes, domestic and foreign, this is the manly answer of Macintosh—

'The question is reducible to this, whether they were to abstain from establishing a free government, because they foresaw it could not be effected without confusion and temporary distress, or to be consoled for such calamities by the view of that happiness to which their labours were to give ultimate permanence and diffusion? A minister is not conceived to be guilty of systematic immorality, because he balances the evils of the most just war with the advantages of that national security which is produced by the reputation of spirit and power:—neither ought the patriot, who balancing the evils of transient anarchy against the inestimable good of established liberty, finds the last preponderate in the scale. Such, in fact, has ever been the reasoning of the leaders in those insurrections, which have preserved the remnant of freedom that still exists amongst mankind. Holland, England, and America must have reasoned thus; and the different portions of liberty which they enjoy have been purchased by the endurance of far greater calamities than have been suffered by France. It is unnecessary to appeal to the wars which, for almost a century, afflicted the Low Countries; but it may not be so to remind England of the price she has paid for the establishment of the principles of the revolution. The disputed succession which arose from that event produced a destructive civil war in Ireland, two rebellions in Scotland, and the consequent slaughter and banishment of thousands of citizens, with the widest confiscations of their properties; not to mention the continental connexions and the foreign wars into which it plunged us, and the necessity thus imposed upon us of maintaining a standing army, and accumulating an enormous public debt.'—*Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, p. 79.

To Burke and his partizans, many of whom had advocated the cause of Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson, and every one of whom had either approved or acquiesced in the policy and justice of the proceedings in 1688, this manly passage must have

been wormwood. It is wholly unanswerable, either generally or particularly. If we are never to stir nor seek to better our condition in any way, until we can grasp good unmixed with evil, there is an end, at once, to all human improvement. If Cavendish, Russell, and Churchill, were justifiable in 1688, and Washington, Adams, and Franklin, in 1775, surely Mirabeau and Brissot were equally so in 1789. From this conclusion there was no escape, and none was ever attempted. It is to be recollected, however, that when these expressions were written, the revolution in France had not exhibited its worst and darkest phases. The extremities of folly and violence which followed, Macintosh lived to deplore, and to be taught by the experience so gained that no theoretical system of rule, at discord with the habits, usages, manners, and prejudices of the nation that attempts to establish it, can possibly last, and that to improve upon what we have, rather than to remodel or seek for new foundations, is the only rational road to national freedom and contentment. Against the concluding phrase of the '*necessity* of accumulating public debt,' we must enter our protest. There can be no such necessity. Sums so lent, may always be levied directly by impost during the lives of the generation that need them; and that this is the just and the only just method of meeting a temporary exigence, no one will deny who has any knowledge of the axioms of civil law, or of the conclusions of its sages as to the conditions of property, and the duties of citizens to a state.

The grand dogma against which Sir James had to struggle at this disgraceful period was, however, the divine right of kings, and the inviolability of any system of treatment of their subjects which they might think proper to establish! Strange to relate, and not more strange than disgraceful is the tale, these monstrous doctrines were paraded in full glare, as late as the beginning of the present century, before the eyes of the English people, and advocated by vast numbers. The milder and more veiled term of 'Legitimacy' was not then hatched. Louis XVI. was monarch by 'Right divine.' He had succeeded Louis XV. lineally; and Louis Quinze having succeeded lineally a predecessor, who could himself trace a lineal descent back to some convenient point of 'Legal memory' during the reign of the line of Capets, there was no more to be said. The prescription was perfect; and beyond that there was no room for anything but treason. As according to the *dictum* of Louis XIV., the monarch centred and merged the whole state in his sole person—an axiom not only admitted but applauded by the whole of the French people of that generation, lay and clerical, it followed logically that the whole apparatus of rule was equally as divine and inviolable as

the king himself; and that, of course, and as a legitimate consequence, the regal sway, whether carried on by the autocrat himself, or by means of ministers, or favourites, or mistresses, through the medium of ordinances, decrees, registrations of edicts, bastilles, or Lettres de Cachet, was a matter prescriptive, intangible, incontrovertible, indubitable, in short unquestionable, and not to be meddled with, either in thought, speech, or writing by any, under penalty of punishment condign, both in this world and the next! Such were the now ludicrous but then serious monstrosities with which Macintosh had to deal. The following passage embodies the substance of his most triumphant reply. In point, keenness, and energy, it vies with the best sentences of Burke. As an argument, at once complete, succinct and bold, it is hardly to be matched :—

‘Nothing can be more weak than to urge the constitutional irresponsibility of kings or parliaments. The laws can never suppose them responsible, because their responsibility supposes the dissolution of society, which is the annihilation of law. In the governments which have hitherto existed, the power of the magistrate is the only article in the social compact; destroy it, and society is dissolved. It is because they cannot be legally and constitutionally, that they must be morally and rationally responsible. It is because there are no remedies to be found within the pale of society, that we are to seek them in nature, and throw our parchment chains in the face of our oppressors. No man can deduce a precedent of law from the revolution; for law cannot exist in the dissolution of government: a precedent of reason and of justice only can be established in it. And perhaps the friends of freedom merit the misrepresentation with which they have been opposed, for trusting their cause to such frail and frivolous auxiliaries, and for seeking in the profligate practices of men what is to be found in the sacred rights of nature. The system of lawyers is indeed widely different; they appeal only to usage, precedents, authorities and statutes; they display their elaborate frivolity and their perfidious friendship, in disgracing freedom with the fantastic honour of a pedigree! * * * * *

This gothic transfer of genealogy to truth and justice is peculiar to politics. The existence of robbery in one age makes its vindication in the next; and the champions of freedom have abandoned the stronghold of right for precedent, which, when the most favourable is, as might be expected from the ages that furnish it, feeble, fluctuating, partial, and equivocal. It is not because we *have been* free, but because we *have a right to be free*, that we ought to demand freedom. Justice and liberty have neither birth nor race, youth nor age. It would be the same absurdity to assert that we have a right to freedom because the Englishmen of Alfred's reign were free, as that three and three are six, *because* they were so in the camp of Genghis Khan. Let us hear no more of this ignoble and ignominious pedigree of

freedom! Let us hear no more of her Saxon, Danish, or Norman ancestors. Let the immortal daughter of reason, of justice, and of God, be no longer confounded with the spurious abortions that have usurped her name.'—Vol. III., p. 134.

That such writing as this, bold and eloquent as it is, at such a time, should at once have invested its author with a perilous fame is not to be wondered at. Sir James became at once subjected to the battery of calumnies, denunciations, and misrepresentations, which was opened in every possible quarter against French liberty, and all who dared to defend the right of Frenchmen to construct their own government. Nothing since has ever approached the strange perversions of common sense and decency that disgraced this period. To use the strong expression of Macintosh, 'the churches resounded with language, at which Laud would have shuddered and Sacheverell would have blushed;' and the name of freedom was blasphemed once a week from every 'orthodox' pulpit in the land. Amongst other misrepresentations, the destruction of the effete and worn-out French despotism was universally attributed to the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Condorcet, Diderot, and the other philosophers of the last century. Nothing could be more absurd. The effect of these writings was only secondary. The grand cause of the *debacle* was the inextricable ruin of the finances. Necker's publication of the 'Compte rendu,' or balance sheet, with its enormous *deficit*, sealed the fate of the monarchy. It was felt there could be no salvation for extravagance after that. The *soubriquet* of 'Madame Deficit' was immediately attached to the unfortunate Marie Antoinette, and a rapid destruction followed. Mr. Swinburne, who was at Paris during this period, gives in his letters recently published, a striking account of these transactions; and it is curious to reflect that the whole *catastrophic* was foretold in England, in a financial treatise published some years before, entitled 'An Exposure of the dreadful state of the French Monarchy.'

Such was the period and such were the circumstances at and under which the 'Vindiciæ Gallicæ' were produced. It is only fair to mention that the intrepid author found reason to modify some of the opinions there expressed. The experience of age gradually moderated the more extreme theoretical notions of youth. His speech on the Reform Bill showed that his contemplation of mankind, as they really exist, had taught him the nullity and peril of sweeping changes, and that the institutions of a people must ameliorate gradually, and rest throughout on the peculiarities of national character. In an essay on the suffrage, written for the 'Edinburgh Review,' his change of sentiment,

on these topics is yet more manifest, and he hesitates to advocate, even for the strong, sober, steady, and practical temperament of the Anglo-Saxon, institutions which in his earlier years he saw no risk in attempting to plant amongst a people so ardent, mercurial, and excitable, as are our Gallic neighbours. In this we deem Sir James to have been perhaps over-cautious. The manner in which the Reform Bill has worked amply proves that, to tender such a boon to the British people, was the very reverse of dangerous; and his historic lore might have taught him that those parliaments, which graced almost every year of the glorious reign of our third Edward, when the patronage of the crown and the direct influence of the aristocracy were less than they now are, were elected under a system of suffrage more extended than that which the Reform Bill proposed to establish.

We now turn to a work of a very different sort, and one which, in our humble opinion, is one of the finest fruits of the talents of its gifted author. We allude to the historical disquisition as to the causes of the Revolution of 1688. This most admirable treatise was composed at a late period of his life; was revised by him, and is now printed for the first time perhaps in a perfect form, and with the last touches of the writer. As a minute, judicious, searching treatise, on an interesting period of our history, this 'Review of the causes of the Revolution' must always occupy a high position. The crisis, the causes of which it minutely details, was one of the most extraordinary, in its multifarious and manifold complications, that is to be found in the annals of nations. It is quite true that, to understand the minute narration of Macintosh, the reader must already have acquired a tolerably accurate general knowledge of English history, especially as regards the leading religious sects, their disputes, their feelings, and their jealousies, by which a people in all ordinary respects prosperous was vexed and torn to pieces. Some knowledge of this description is, past a doubt, absolutely necessary to enable ordinary readers to follow the ramifications of this interesting and most masterly investigation. To readers, however, possessed of this knowledge, this inquiry must in its perusal prove a treat, not easily to be matched in the range of our historical literature.

At the eventful period under examination, that is to say, at the period of the accession of James II., parties were in the most extraordinary state conceivable; the country, physically, was in a state of ease, comfort and prosperity. During the reign of Charles II., it was unquestionably disgraced in its foreign relations, and its king a pensioner of the 'grand monarque,' as he was then styled. The absurd and monstrous notions of

royal prerogative, however, cherished by Charles, as well as the other Stuarts, and the disputes with his parliaments which they perpetually caused, had one great and salutary effect. The Commons held the strings of the national purse. This purse the absurd and profligate courses of Charles induced them to keep shut during his entire disgraceful reign. Of this the people reaped the entire benefit. They cared little for the squabbles between Charles and the Whigs, whilst taxes were thus kept light; the consequence was, that though the king was in name despotic, it was only a name; the nation kept their money in their own pockets; they rapidly recovered from the effects of the confusion of the civil war, and the exactions of the long parliament, who it is believed expended more in one year, on the average, than Charles II., when king, was able to obtain in three. Thus, though the government was a disgraceful one, its folly and weakness left the people at liberty to prosper, amidst the absurdities of their rulers, and a despot who could not extort taxes was found to be much less of a burden than a parliament that, under the name of 'Liberty,' removed the burden of imposts from the land, and invented and established an 'Excise.'

If, however, the bodily state and condition of the people were excellent when James II. succeeded his brother, their spiritual state was just the reverse; the kingdom was split into a variety of religious sects and parties, mostly hostile to each other, and mostly stained by tenets of intolerance, theological hatred, and persecution. First, there was the Catholic party, consisting of men who, amidst all the cruelties of preceding reigns, had under the Tudors even, adhered to the ancient faith. The English church was itself split into three parties; there were the non-jurors, men Papists, in all but the name, in their doctrines, who refused to take the oath prescribed by the act of uniformity, because it suited not their notions of sacerdotal power. Again, there were the high churchmen, men determined upon preserving a despotic power for the church, fond of its property, as well as its doctrines, and for the sake of both determined to persecute dissent of all sorts to the death. To high-church doctrine and tenets of persecution, quite in accordance with those of the worst times of the sway of Rome, these men added the dogmas of passive obedience and non-resistance to kingly power, however tyrannically exercised; these monstrosities they made a part of what they called catholic doctrine, although it was notorious that until the accession of the Tudors, such notions had never been heard of in England, and that amongst the names of those who wrung Magna-charta from the tyrant John, are those of various

prelates of the Anglican catholic church, whose rights as a clergy are there stipulated for. Distinct from these were the low-churchmen, men who kept a keen eye on the church property, but who were unwilling to admit the arbitrary doctrines of Laud and his successors; were somewhat latitudinarian in doctrine, and who therefore, being themselves stigmatized as schismatics, had naturally a friendly feeling for the great body of nonconformists who made up the rest of the nation, including under that name such grades of dissent, and they were not few, as then existed.

Such was the religious state of the nation when James II. became king. Under his brother, the church had obtained ample opportunity to persecute all without her pale, and the covenanters of Scotland and the English nonconformists of all opinions had suffered accordingly. Prosperous and at ease in their worldly affairs, Englishmen had been for years tormented with plots and executions arising out of religious jealousy and hatred; and a country which might have been a paradise was, by sheer intolerance, made to resemble something very much the reverse. Sir James Macintosh, indeed, admits in his treatise that there is reason to believe that both Charles and James Stuart were more tolerant than those around them. This, however, is a point that must ever be in dispute. If Charles did not approve, he permitted persecution, the most horrible, to be practised by his counsellors and bishops. If James, as we believe, was a sincere catholic, it is difficult to believe how, at that period, he could eschew persecution; especially if it be true, as Macintosh asserts (*Treatise on the Affairs of Holland*), that James actually offered to Louis XIV., to detain as a prisoner the Prince of Orange, then his visitor, provided this atrocious step would ensure ruin to the protestant cause in Holland! When James was fairly seated on the throne, however, a mighty change was immediately felt. Despite the attempts made to exclude him, on account of his open profession of the religion of Rome, it is admitted that he was on the whole popular on his accession. Though imprudent as a politician, he was a man of business, and well managed the ordinary routine of a government. Of his prerogative his notions were every whit as absurd as those of the rest of his family. He believed himself absolute by divine right; and he soon took occasion to show that he was not the man to let his kingly powers sleep in abeyance. He immediately displayed the same hatred of parliaments that characterized his brother. Sooth to say, however, so long had the people been accustomed to hear these doctrines from the pulpit, the bar, and the press, that, had it not been for the cruelties that followed Monmouth's rebellion, there seems too much reason to suppose James might have run a career

very different from that to which he was destined. The atrocities of Jeffreys and Kirke in the West of England, after the rout of Sedgmoor, Sir James Macintosh accounts, and properly accounts, to be one of the leading causes of the revolution. The following is his account of the trial of Mrs. Lisle, and we may premise that it affords a fair specimen of the entire proceedings during what was well termed 'the bloody campaign.'

'She said in her defence that she knew Mr. Hickes to be a presbyterian clergyman, and thought he had absconded, because there were warrants out against him on that account. All the acts of concealment which were urged as proofs of her intentional breach of law were reconcilable with the defence. Orders had been issued, at the beginning of the revolt, to seize 'all disaffected and suspicious persons, especially ALL nonconformist ministers.' And Jeffreys, himself, unwittingly strengthened her case by declaring his conviction that all presbyterians had a hand in the rebellion. He did not go through the formality of repeating so probable a defence to the jury! They, however, hesitated; they asked the chief-justice whether it were as much treason to receive Hickes before as after conviction? He told them it was, which was literally true; but he wilfully concealed from them that by the law, such as it was, the receiver of a traitor could not be brought to trial till the principal traitor had been convicted or outlawed;—a provision, indeed, so manifestly necessary to justice that, without the observance of it, Hickes might be acquitted of treason, after Mrs. Lisle had been executed for harbouring him as a traitor. Four judges looked silently on this suppression of truth, which produced the same effect with positive falsehood, and allowed the limits of a barbarous law to be overpassed, in order to destroy an aged woman for an act of charity. The jury retired, and remained so long in deliberation as to provoke the wrath of the chief-justice! When they returned into court, they expressed their doubt whether the prisoner knew that Hickes had been in Monmouth's army; the chief-justice assured them that the proof was complete. Three times they repeated their doubts: the chief-justice as often reiterated his declaration with growing impatience and rage. At this critical moment of the last appeal of the jury to the court, the defenceless female at the bar made an effort to speak. Jeffreys, taking advantage of formalities, instantly silenced her, and the jury were at length overawed into a verdict of 'guilty!' He then broke out into a needless insult to the strongest affections of nature, saying to the jury, 'Gentlemen, had I been among you, and if she had been my own mother, I should have found her guilty!' On the next morning, when he had to pronounce sentence of death, he could not even then abstain from invectives against the presbyterians, of whom he supposed Mrs. Lisle to be one: yet mixing artifice with his fury, he tried to lure her into discoveries by ambiguous phrases, which might excite her hopes of life, without pledging him to obtain pardon. He directed that she should be *burned alive* on the afternoon

of the same day; but the clergy of the cathedral of Winchester successfully interceded for an interval of three days. This interval gave time for an application to the king.'—Vol. ii. p. 22.

An application to the king!—vain was the application, for here the undoubted cruelty of James appeared in its bloodiest hues. The king declared that 'he would not reprieve her for a day.' He would not even change the horrid punishment into beheading, until *precedents* had been sought out, and strong interest excited! The cause of all this hatred was that her husband had been one of the judges of Charles I. The poor lady, herself, had always been kind to the royalists at that period, and it will hardly be believed that her son had actually served in the king's army against Monmouth, and had helped to quell the very rebellion, on account of which his aged mother was put to death.

After the defeat of the ill-concerted and worse-conducted enterprise of Monmouth, James felt himself strong upon his throne, and lost no time in setting about his rash and arbitrary design of forcing upon the kingdom a religion, which, though it was his own, he well knew was, for various reasons, good or bad, odious to a great majority of his people. He now set about it with his usual rashness and total want of all politic or prudential considerations. Of his own attachment to the Catholic faith he had never made much of a secret. For that he was too honest; for that James was in disposition sincere his worst enemies never denied. Not content, however, with celebrating mass in great pomp; with admitting a nuncio or envoy from the pope; and with trying to force papists into the universities by suspending the college statutes, he set about converting all his ministers and courtiers; and it was soon understood that the easiest and shortest path to promotion was to be presented at court as a recent convert to Romanism. The scenes of hypocrisy that then took place exceeded all that had occurred since the Reformation, when the majority of the nobles became protestants under Edward VI.; again catholics under Mary; and protestants once more at the bidding of Elizabeth. All the courtiers, however, were not thus disgracefully pliable, and some of the answers made to the solicitations of the royal agents in the task of conversion, as recorded by Macintosh, are highly amusing:—

'Middleton, one of the secretaries of state, a man of ability, supposed to have no strong principles of religion, was equally inflexible. The catholic divine who was sent to him, began by attempting to reconcile his understanding to the mysterious doctrine of transubstantiation. 'Your lordship (said he) believes the doctrine of the Trinity.' 'Who told you so?' answered Middleton. 'You are come here to

prove your own religion, not to ask about mine.' The astonished priest is said to have immediately retired. Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, is also said to have sent away a monk, who came to convert him, by a jest upon the same doctrine. 'I have convinced myself, (said he) by much reflection, that God made man; but I cannot believe that man can make God!' Colonel Kirke, from whom strong scruples were hardly to be expected, is said to have answered the king's desire that he would listen to catholic divines, by declaring that, when at Tangier, he had engaged himself to the Emperor of Morocco, if ever he changed his religion, to become a Mahometan! Lord Churchill (afterwards Duke of Marlborough), though neither insensible to the kindness of James, nor distinguished by a strict conformity to the precepts of religion, withstood the attempts of his generous benefactor to bring him over to the church of Rome. He said of himself 'that though he could not lead the life of a saint, he was resolved, if there was occasion for it, to show the resolution of a martyr!'—Vol. ii. p. 92.

These scenes are as lamentable as they are ludicrous; but others, more important, were to be superadded. Besides these private attempts to turn the hearts of his people to what he deemed 'the right way,' the infatuated monarch was now determined to commence a vigorous and open system of assault upon the established religion of his country; which, if a universal toleration were allowed, would—he told D'Adda, the papal nuncio—be the first to fall. In pursuance of this design, James, who could not with decency claim toleration for his own faith, without extending it to that of others, at length determined to publish a declaration of indulgence which should, by royal favour, confer upon all sectaries the privilege of worshipping God in their own way, and after their own conscience. In the language of this declaration he took high ground. The most plausible mode would have been to have assumed this power as head of the church. This, however, he did not do; but assumed as a part of his kingly prerogative, adding, that he had no doubt of the sanction of parliament as soon as he should call one. In the meantime there was no one to question the legality of the document, and it was accordingly dispersed over the kingdom. But this was a small part of the royal adventure. By the act of uniformity, all dissenters, exercising public worship, were subjected to divers severe pains and penalties. To get rid of this, the king claimed a power to 'dispense' with such laws in case of necessity, of which he was to be the judge; founding this claim upon some precedents of penalties remitted by royal interposition in some former time. Under the shape of a prerogative of mercy, this was in truth a power to dispense with all law. Pardon is an interposition for an individual; but this was a cancelling of a sta-

tute by exempting all from its enactments; and, if one law might thus be neutralized and nullified, so might all. The bait, however, at first took. Some of the persecuted dissenters eagerly took advantage of the benevolence thus unexpectedly extended to them, and addresses of thanks from numerous congregations were presented to the king, who encouraged them by every means in his power. But some of the dissenters from the first suspected the real design, and so did the church generally; five of the most pliable prelates only, with some of their clergy, sending addresses to thank the king for his assurances of protection for their rights. The universities, and the great body of churchmen, however, took the alarm; and the king was warned early that, if he expected passive obedience from those who had preached it to others, he would find himself mistaken; from some of the judges whom he consulted as to his 'dispensing power,' he received a similar intrepid warning. Sir John Jones told him 'he was sorry to find an opinion expected from him 'which only indigent, ignorant, or ambitious men could give.' James, irritated at this plain rebuff, answered he would soon find twelve judges of his opinion. 'Twelve judges, sir,' replied Jones, 'you may find, but hardly twelve lawyers.'

It is hardly necessary to add, that, undaunted by the open resistance of the universities to his arbitrary attempts to force catholics amongst their body, and by the opposition and remonstrances of great numbers of men, the wiser and more moderate catholics, the imprudent king renewed his 'declaration of indulgence,' and issued an order that it should be read from the pulpit in every church in the kingdom. This step was the really decisive one, and rapidly produced all that followed. The bishops, seeing the destruction of all they held dear, now clearly menaced, refused to obey, and petitioned the king to revoke his order. The king, who had in his favour two precedents—for the clergy had so read the declaration on the Rye-house Plot, and his brother's apology for dissolving his last two parliaments—refused the prayer of the petition, which he treated as a seditious libel. The bishops, however, persevered, and the result was, that the insensate bigot and his besotted council had the amazing imprudence to commit the bishops to the Tower as seditious libellers. This inconsiderate outrage turned the tide of opinion finally against James. The effect was prodigious; for the spectacle brought, as it were, before the eyes of the people as realities, all the old tales of former popish cruelty and persecution. 'The scene,' says Sir James, 'seemed to be a procession of martyrs. 'Thousands begged their blessing, some ran into the water to 'implore it. Both banks of the Thames were lined with multi-

‘tudes, who, when they were too distant to be heard, manifested their feelings by falling on their knees, and raising up their hands, beseeching Heaven to guard the sufferers for religion and liberty. On landing at the Tower, several of the *guards* knelt down to receive their blessing, whilst some, even of the *officers*, yielded to the general impulse.’ This would have been enough for most men; but when had ever zealots eyes, or bigots understanding? James was resolved to try the bishops for a libel.

From this hour all men of sense, of all opinions, seem to have deemed a revolution as certain and inevitable. Even the brutal tool, Jeffreys, sent a secret message to the Tower to assure the bishops of his sorrow and his services; and, strange to relate, amongst the visitors of the imprisoned prelates were a deputation of ten nonconformist ministers. At this distance of time it is difficult for ordinary minds to conceive under what motives these persecuted men could have acted thus, on this occasion. This church had, from the moment of the restoration, spared no means, nor stopped at any cruelties, to deprive all dissenters of every remnant of toleration or refuge. In Scotland they had been hunted down like wolves; and in England numbers had been, on various pretences, exiled, imprisoned, and put to death. Yet these men made common cause with the bishops, now that their turn was come. Nothing can account for this but what we must call the unmanly horror with which, from and after the time of Titus Oates, the nation had contemplated the slightest mention of popery. At and after that disgraceful period, men who would have faced a battery of cannon became children at the very sound of a ‘popish plot;’ and this feeling it was which at last completed the unanimity of alarm and hatred with which the whole British people now viewed the proceedings of the king. James, however, was totally blind to his fate. The birth of a prince of Wales, at this critical moment, would have given him a happy opportunity to pardon the recusant bishops. As it seemed a providential interposition in his favour, however, he only made it an argument for going on. The bishops were brought to trial in Westminster Hall; they were defended boldly and unanswerably by Pollexfen and Finch. The court wavered. The jury took heart—and they were acquitted!

The result we must give in the words of Sir James Macintosh:—

‘No sooner were these words uttered than a loud huzza arose from the audience in the court. It was instantly echoed from without by a shout of joy, which sounded like a crack of the ancient and massy roof of Westminster Hall. It passed with electrical rapidity from voice to voice, along the infinite multitude who waited in the streets, reaching

the Temple in a few minutes. For a short time no man seemed to know where he was. No business was done for hours. The solicitor-general informed Lord Sunderland in the presence of the nuncio, that never within the memory of man had there been heard such cries of applause mingled with tears of joy. 'The acclamations,' says Sir John Reresby, 'were a very rebellion of noise.' In no long time they ran to the camp at Hounslow, and were repeated with an ominous voice by the soldiers in the hearing of the king, who on being told they were for the acquittal of the bishops, said, with an ambiguity probably arising from confusion, 'So much the worse for them!' The jury were everywhere received with the loudest acclamations: hundreds, with tears in their eyes, embraced them as deliverers. The bishops, almost alarmed at their own success, escaped from the huzzas of the people as privately as possible, exhorting them 'to fear God and honour the king.' Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, had remained in court during the trial, unnoticed by any of the crowd of nobility and gentry, and Sprat met with little more regard; the former, in going to his carriage, was called a 'wolf in sheep's clothing,' and as he was very corpulent, the mob cried out, 'Room for the man with a Pope in his belly!' They bestowed also on Sir William Williams very mortifying proofs of disrespect.—Vol. ii. p. 207.

This scene probably determined the future great soldier and statesman, Churchill, as to the course he was to take. If it did not, the following scene, which was the final, must have settled the question. A written test, binding those who took it to contribute to the repeal of the Penal Laws was prepared, and this the demented king was impolitic enough to tender to the soldiers.

'The experiment,' says Macintosh, 'was first tried on Lord Litchfields', and all who hesitated to comply with the king's commands were ordered to lay down their arms;—*The whole regiment*, except two captains and a few catholic privates, actually laid down their arms. The king was thunderstruck; and, after a gloomy silence, ordered them to take up their muskets, saying that he should not again *do them the honour to consult them!*'

They returned the compliment with interest. The events that at once followed; the landing of the Prince of Orange; the desertion of the unfortunate zealot by the entire nation; and his ultimate flight and abdication, are notorious. One striking circumstance Sir James Macintosh has recorded. Chief-Justice Jeffreys, when dying in the Tower of the injuries he received from an avenging people, said amongst other things that 'if he 'had made the 'Western Campaign' as bloody as those who sent 'him would have had it, more blood would have been spilled!' Whether this miscreant was to be believed, even in the pangs of

death is very questionable : but if he were, this reflects a deep stain upon the character of James.

That as an accurate, eloquent, powerful and spirited disquisition upon one of the most interesting and important periods of our history this tract must always hold a high station, few readers will be disposed to doubt. It has, however, one great fault of omission. Sir James has no doubt given us, as the fruits of a most careful and historical research, a vivid and striking detail of the series of events that brought about the grand changes of 1688 ; but he has stopped here. He has copied Suetonius rather than Tacitus. We have a picture of facts and events furnished with all the nicety and life of the Flemish school of painting ; but we have only this. Sir James has neglected the philosophical province of the historian or annalist ; and shrunk from laying before his readers a summary of the characters of the leading actors in this extraordinary drama, and of the motives which actuated them. This is an omission much to be regretted ; because on this particular portion of our history few readers are, we suspect, likely to supply it for themselves. As we, however, hold all suppressions or omissions of the veritable to be ultimately injurious and wrong, we shall not deny ourselves the pleasure of a few remarks on the subject, which are, in our opinion, necessary to a full apprehension of truth.

It has been too much the custom of writers to treat the Revolution of 1688 as if they who were most active in the promotion of that great event were influenced by motives of the purest patriotism, and dared to change the succession to a throne solely from love of freedom and hatred of arbitrary power. This was not, however, the case. After events plainly proved it not to be so ; and hence the question returns upon us, what then were the motives which influenced the revolution and its promoters ? We reply, they were in many instances pecuniary and selfish, and not disinterested. If we ask ourselves plainly *what* brought about the final catastrophe, the answer is, the junction of the church with the leading Whigs, and the junction of these again with the great body of dissenters. Now, of this great combination, which for the moment included in it a vast majority of the country, we do not mean to say that many did not act from high and holy motives, especially amongst the nonconformists : but what was true of many, was not true of most. Who, at this time, believes that the church was influenced in the course it took by any new view of the value of free institutions ? Who will assert that even the leading Whigs, the Cavendishes, the Russels, and others who were the actual agents in bringing over the Prince of Orange, were

so influenced? The truth was, a huge amount of property was now at stake, and for this was the game mainly played by numbers, who, with liberty on the tongue, had something less pure at heart. If James could possibly have succeeded in his plans, it was clear that the whole of the ancient church-property, including the immense possessions in lay lands, as well as the estates and tithes still enjoyed by the clergy, must have reverted. Mary and Elizabeth had preserved their thrones by acquiescing in the distribution brought about by the Reformation. But with the Reformation the Stuarts were always really at war, and the triumph of James II. would have been almost tantamount to a triumph over the Protestant Reformation itself. This was felt to be the case. In such event, Holland must have fallen before the arms of Louis XIV.; and Holland and England severed from the cause, what must have been the fate of Protestant Germany? This was felt to be the real view of affairs; and hence the junction of the Whigs, who held immense parcels of inappropriate tithes and abbey-lands, with the church, which at the moment felt its own property in jeopardy. Hence also the junction of the Tory universities; and hence, lastly, the junction of the persecuted nonconformists with the other three, upon the principle that not only liberty in England, but the entire Protestant cause was at stake. That this was a true view on the part of the nonconformists, and that *they* acted a truly noble part, we of course mean to assert. But this measure of praise we cannot assign to all the other actors. When we see men acting thus, who had during their lives preached intolerance of the rights of conscience, and passive obedience, and non-resistance to

‘The right divine of kings to govern wrong,’

we must look about for other motives, and to find them we must look lower. The truth of this view of the philosophy of the events of 1688, the after events surely confirmed. As soon as the immediate danger had passed, numbers who had acquiesced in the expulsion of James, opposed to the end the liberal and protestant principles of his successor. Such stipulations in favour of political liberty, as had been agreed to on the accession of William, were got rid of under his successors. Triennial parliaments were quickly made septennial; placemen readily found entrance into the house of commons; which soon merged in itself the independence of the crown, which the Stuarts had struggled to preserve, but in vain, because they did so from motives as destitute of wisdom as of virtue. Whilst the crown continued antagonistic with the house of commons, the liberties and purses of the people were secure; because the commons’ interest and safety lay in withholding supplies. When, after the vain

attempts of William to preserve it, the independence of the throne really merged in the two houses, profusion went on unchecked; the fable of 'The Sun, the Wind, and the Traveller' was exemplified: and what force never could effect, bribery produced. These considerations ought not to be lost sight of. Absolutely necessary for the preservation of the rights of conscience, the Revolution was in the end destructive of the salutary power of the first estate of the realm. The mixed sway of 'king, lords, and commons,' continued in name only.

The two houses became independent of the crown on one hand, and of the people on the other; and the legislative and executive powers became really centred in one body; an anomaly from which we may date the evils we now endure.

To the other historical and political tracts and speeches of Macintosh we can afford only a limited share of attention. His account of the partition of Poland is less vividly written than his tract on the revolution, and is probably less accurate in minor detail; but to its author, as a statesman, it does quite as much honour. With his concluding sentences we entirely accord; and we may add that it always seemed to us that the grand blunder of Napoleon, as a statesman, was his omitting, at the earliest period when it was in his power, to re-establish the ancient kingdom of Poland in its integrity as to power and territory, but with institutions modified in accordance with the requirements of modern circumstances. Such a regeneration, and by him, would have been his best barrier against the deep hostility of the three powers of Austria, Russia, and Prussia; and whilst it would have operated as a diversion in favour of the Turkish empire, now menaced with ultimate destruction by the aggressive ambition of the Muscovite, would have conducted to the general interests of Europe. The following is the concluding reflection of Sir James:—

'The partition of Poland was the model of all those acts of rapine which have been committed by monarchs or by republicans during the wars excited by the French revolution. No single cause has contributed so much to alienate from ancient institutions, and loosen their respect for established governments. When monarchs show so signal a disregard to immemorial possession and legal right, it is in vain for them to hope that subjects will not copy the precedent. The law of nations is a code without tribunals, without ministers, and without arms, which rests only on a general opinion of its usefulness, and on the influence of that opinion in the councils of states; and most of all, perhaps, on an habitual reverence produced by the constant appeal to its rules, even by those who did not observe them, and strengthened by the elaborate artifice to which the proudest tyrants deigned to submit,

in their attempts to elude an authority which they did not dare to dispute. One signal triumph over such an authority was sufficient to destroy its power. Philip II., and Louis XIV., had often violated the law of nations ; but the spoilers of Poland overthrew it.—Vol. ii. p. 384.

The tract on the authorship of the once celebrated and much controverted 'Icon Basilike,' is, in our opinion, a perfectly successful one, notwithstanding the reasonings of the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, and the special pleading of his congenial allies—the Quarterly reviewers of that period. Upon the broad view of the question we may conclude, in the absence of positive proof of the authorship, that had Charles I. been the writer, the truth never would have been doubtful. Had the MS. from which the Icon was printed been in the autograph of the king, it would have been religiously preserved and transmitted. In the lack of anything like probable evidence of the book having really been the composition of Charles, the letter of Clarendon to Gauden, the rapid promotion of that very insatiable clerical cormorant to the sees, first of Exeter and next of Worcester, and the equivocal expression of Charles II. that 'all in that book was *not gospel*!' are surely sufficient. Clarendon says expressly, 'the particular which you often renewed I doe confesse was imparted to me under secrecy;' adding, 'and truly when it ceases to be a secrett, I know nobody will be gladd of it but *Mr. Milton*.' Milton, in his 'Iconoclastes,' had denied the royal authorship; and against that denial and Clarendon's corroboration of it, all we have brought consists merely of hearsay stories—trifling in themselves, inconsistent with each other—such as reports of persons, who had been told by other persons, that they had seen the MS. at Naseby interlined by the king, or that the writing of the copy from which it was printed was the king's, though different from his usual hand! In truth, this matter has occasioned much more controversy than it is worth, and as such we drop it.

Of the minor essays of Macintosh, we least like 'the character of Mr. Canning,' first printed in the Keepsake. It is, in fact, too like its subject, flashy and false. No man pretending to statesmanship was ever more over-estimated than Mr. Canning has been: and in one of the first sentences of his essay, Sir James goes far to settle his pretensions as a statesman, at the same time that he somewhat derogates from his own. 'The Miguelites of Portugal (says he), the apostolicals of Spain, the Jesuit faction in France, and the divan of Constantinople, raised a shout of joy at the fall of their dreaded enemy!' Now, as to Spain and Portugal, the better judgment of Sir James might have taught him that no projects could be at once more pernicious and

absurd than those which have led this country to attempt to plant, amongst a race of Iberian celts and bigoted catholics, a form of government which grew up amongst Anglo-Saxons, and was brought to its present shape by Protestants, and in their eyes heretics. As for the 'dread' inspired by this minister, that was manifested by the French expedition of 1823, when the Duc d'Angoulême, at the head of one hundred thousand men, dispersed the Cortes, crushed English influence, and would have proceeded, unawed by Canning, to have reconquered the revolted Spanish American colonies, had the insidious project not been resisted by Austria and Russia. That the imbecile course of the British cabinet, at that period, has had a pernicious effect upon our diplomacy ever since, we are well assured; nor was any after act of Canning's administration in the slightest degree calculated to redeem the character then so fatally injured. His recognition of the independence of the Spanish colonies, so much vaunted, was three or four years too late, and was forestalled by the United States. His Turkish policy was still worse. Filled with the childish idea of regenerating Greece, a thing as impossible as for him to raise Leonidas or Miltiades from the dead, he annihilated the naval force of the sultan, set up a miserable government in Greece to be the alternate tool of France and Russia, and laid that empire, the integrity of which the great Chatham had declared to be indispensable to the naval and commercial supremacy of Great Britain, at the feet of the crocodile Muscovite. At home, his total ignorance of all a minister ought to know was as disgracefully conspicuous. When the fearful monetary crisis of 1825-6 burst upon the community, Mr. Canning, and the equally incapable and empty but less flippant Goderich, were alike ignorant of the causes of the convulsion and of its remedy; and public credit was only saved by a lucky issue of one pound notes, found by chance, and put into circulation by advice of a man who never was a member of any government. Of this transaction we have, however, in a former number, given a true detail. In short, Mr. Canning was worthy of the body amongst whom he passed for a great man, the old unreformed House of Commons. There, at that period, a few trite hexameters, cleverly mouthed from Virgil, passed for classical learning; and to put truth out of countenance by a sneer, and to baffle exposure by a jest, were the grand requisites of the orator and statesman. That for his pre-eminence in these qualifications, Mr. Canning richly deserved the statue which they raised to him we shall be the last to deny; but Sir James Macintosh was not the man to write his *Eloge*, and should have left it to some more congenial pen.

From this misplaced eulogy, we might turn to a biography more worthy of the right-thinking mind and elegant and versatile genius of Macintosh—the ‘Life of Sir Thomas More.’ But our remaining space must be given to the best, perhaps, of the varied and multiform writings of Macintosh—his ‘Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy;’ and we cannot conclude better than by bestowing a few pages of remark on the topics suggested by this work. As far as it goes to evince the accurate knowledge of the science of mind possessed by its author, it is difficult to praise this essay too highly. It is clearly the composition of a mind gifted with much metaphysical ability, skilled in drawing and in comprehending nice and subtle distinctions, and not liable to be confounded by those delusions, the grand stumbling-blocks of all psychological inquirers, which arise out of the unguarded use of words, and the neglect of those rigid definitions of the precise meaning of terms, without which mental science degenerates into a mere verbal puzzle. To dissect this dissertation minutely, would take us far beyond the limits which, in an article like the present, we must assign to ourselves. The utmost we can do is to give some general views of ethical and metaphysical science as delineated or alluded to by Macintosh; to trace in mental science that which may be said to be known or established, as distinguished from that which has been merely assumed as a postulate, or hypothecated as a part of some system; and lastly, to indicate, if we can, the direction in which future inquiries ought to be made, if the demonstration of truth rather than the temporary establishment of some fancy-founded hypothesis is to be the result of such research.

In proceeding to fill up the faint outline which we have sketched, we must premise that this tract of Macintosh is precisely that which it is called, as far as he could make it so. It is strictly ‘Ethical,’ and, in other words, a spirited and succinct history of moral science, as that science has existed from early ages to the present time. As a specimen of elegant, and at the same time condensed, terse, and scientific composition, it is worthy of much praise. It intelligibly tells what is to be known in a department of knowledge, abstruse and difficult to be comprehended. To the performance of this delicate and difficult task Sir James has limited himself; and he has performed it happily. His mode is judicious, and at the same time cautious. He has steered clear of that fault so common amongst writers in this department of philosophy—the fault of overloading their readers with preliminary subtleties. He has briefly and clearly indicated the nature of moral investigation, and warned his reader most emphatically of that grand distinction which in-

investigators of this subject must ever bear in mind—that is to say, that the quality of actions, whatever it be, which determines their moral fitness or unfitness, is a thing entirely separate from that faculty of the human mind, whatever it be, which enables it to come to moral conclusions, and to pass moral judgments. All moral inquiry naturally divides itself into these two branches, nor can we, without such division, satisfactorily proceed one single step in an examination so important in the end, and so delicate in the detail. Having cleared his ground, our author commences his dissertation by a rapid retrospect of ancient ethics, as treated of by the philosophers of Greece and Rome, by Zeno and Epicurus, by Plato and Socrates, by Aristotle, by Arcesilaus and Carneades; then by Cicero and Seneca, and, later still, by the Alexandrian school, by Plotinus, and Proclus, and their followers. From these writers Sir James naturally comes down to the ethics of the mediæval schoolmen, to the casuistries of Aquinas, William of Ockham, and those who carried forward the grand dispute of the ‘Nominalists and Realists,’ which he justly describes as being really an anticipation of the more modern controversy as to ‘general or abstract ideas.’ Of the strange and often perverted, but often acute, dialectics of these periods, we have a brief and rapid glance. The dissertation itself, however, properly begins only with modern ethics, of which we have a very lucid and accurate detail. It commences with a view of the moral doctrines of Grotius and Hobbes. After these we have an exposition of the various theories of Cudworth, Clarke, Bossuet, Fenelon, Leibnitz, Malebranche, and Edwards, as far as these writers touched ethical science. To these succeed the moral writings of Butler, Hutcheson, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Smith, Hartley, Tucker, Reid, Paley, Stewart, and Brown; and the essay is wound up by some general remarks on the peculiar doctrines, touching ethical science, now prevalent in Germany, and beginning to pervade France and England, as laid down by the celebrated Kant and his successors, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel.

Such is the outline of the dissertation on the progress of ethical philosophy. It certainly affords a remarkably clear detail of the march of the science of morals, up to the time when it was written. Here is, however, its sole merit. This was, probably, all that its author intended to do. This is, certainly, all that he has done. To the amount of that which is known he has added nothing. He has merely done for ethics that which Enfield, Sir William Drummond, and others have done for moral philosophy or general metaphysics—that is to say, made a sort of map of the science. We cannot gather from the dissertation, with certainty,

what were the opinions of the author as to the subject which he treats. With a body of materials on which to found a judgment, he appears to have shrunk from the ordeal. This we cannot but consider as a defect in one undertaking such a work. It has an unpleasing *negative* effect upon the mind of the student; producing, as it does, a sense of incertitude, and a tendency to that Pyrrhonic conclusion, at once absurd and painful, that, in this direction, nothing can be concluded! From that gross selfishness, into which Hobbes and those who have followed him would resolve all human actions, the mind of Macintosh evidently revolts. The ethical defects of that celebrated writer, he evidently sees. Of the omission, by Hobbes, of all proper consideration of that affection of the human mind which we call 'sympathy,' he is well aware. But it is not easy to say how far he is inclined to go in the opposite direction, nor whether he deems it possible, as Fenelon did, to conceive of any act of the mind with which something of self is not mingled. The French bishop imagined he could apprehend a love of God perfectly pure, and not only untinged by all consideration of fear of punishment or hope of reward, but totally apart from any feeling of self, however refined or however spiritualized. It is probable the acute intellect of Macintosh would see the insurmountable objections to all theories of this exalted kind, whether of Fenelon, or of Clarke, or of others who have striven after the untenable notion of a pure disinterestedness in human action. However we may recoil from the grosser selfishness of Hobbism, reflection must in the end convince us that every such theory must be destroyed by one ultimate difficulty—that difficulty being the total want of *motive* by which the mind is to act at all. In his account of the moral theory of Dr. Clarke, Sir James shows us that this excellent person fancied he could escape both from that which he was pleased to deem 'Hobbism,' and from some of the portions of Calvinistic theology, by resolving all morals into a consideration of the abstract 'fitness of things.' This abstract fitness of things he deemed to be the object of moral approbation in itself, and apart from any consideration of the will of God, or of the divine disapprobation of those who might violate it. Clarke, in short, went so far as to assert that to sin was the same sort of absurdity as to attempt to alter the relations of numbers, or to withstand a *reductio ad absurdum* in mathematics. Granting this, however, we yet end in the difficulty before described,—the absence of all motive to enable the mind to act at all. If we insulate our own selves,—our own happiness or unhappiness—from this 'fitness of things,' then comes the question, *how* is the mind to be acted upon by contemplating it? In this case, if we can con-

ceive the mind to act at all, we must conceive it to act either without a motive for acting in one way rather than another, (which we hold to be impossible;) or to be acted upon by something which appeals not to sympathy, nor reflection, nor any quality, through which the mind is moved—a supposition which seems to include a plain contradiction. It is not easy to fancy that an intellect, like that of Macintosh, should fail to see this objection to all the fanciful systems which attempt to set up a pure disinterestedness in moral agents. Indeed, it is evident that he did, in some sort, perceive the objection. All we wish to convey is, that he did not state his views as to this point, with the confidence and force which, we think, the occasion demanded at his hands, and that he has occasionally used expressions which, if rigidly construed, are hardly consistent with a full perception of the truth. In the praise which Macintosh accords to Hartley, the author of the ‘Observations on Man,’ in as far as the doctrine of the association of ideas is concerned, we are inclined to concur. Our notion of Hartley is, in fact, that of Priestley, who was at the pains to recast Hartley’s theory of the association of ideas, and publish it, divested of the material theory of vibrations and vibratiuncules with which its author literally overlaid it. With materialism it has nothing to do; and we agree with the estimate which Macintosh seems to have formed of its value, as a means of explaining certain mental phenomena, which are certainly difficult of explanation without it. Hartley has very clearly demonstrated that certain acts of the mind, as well as of the body, which were at first deliberate and voluntary, become, in effect, involuntary and mechanical, from the force of association alone. Hence, the mind, at last, comes to exercise an instantaneous and almost involuntary judgment as to various classes of human actions; this judgment having been at first deliberate, but having become involuntary and immediate, by virtue alone of habit, and the constant association of certain ideas with certain other ideas. It is probably the ignorance of this fact, or the want of attention to its extensive application, that has led to the doctrine of an innate ‘moral sense,’ or of an innate ‘common sense,’ enabling us to judge of certain acts and certain propositions by intuition. Reid and his followers saw that mankind were accustomed to come to immediate conclusions as to the truth or falsehood of many propositions, and as to the morality and immorality of many acts. To account for the universality and apparent mechanism of these conclusions, the doctrines of an intuitive ‘common sense,’ and ‘moral sense,’ were set up. The probability of such gifts was argued, upon the ground that they really afforded the only refuge against a uni-

versal scepticism; those who so argued forgetting that, of all the absurdities ever broached by the perversity or insanity of man, 'Pyrrhonism' is the most absurd. Well might the poet say—

'He who affirms that 'nought can be affirmed,'
Stabs his own argument; which, like the babe
Birth-nipped, is dead ere it hath life!'

Of all sophistries surely that is the most hopeless which sets out with an assertion that nothing can be asserted. In the praise which our author bestows upon Reid we cannot altogether join. His 'common sense' is merely a bold assumption—a dogma, invented to account for phenomena which its inventor could not otherwise explain, but which may surely be otherwise explained. 'Do unto others that which you would they should do unto you,' is the root of all morality. For an exhibition of the *modus operandi* we must look to that faculty of the mind designated as 'sympathy,' and to the association of ideas in the mind in a certain order of sequence. 'Sympathy' enables us to put ourselves in the place of him over whom circumstances give us a moral power. 'Association' has connected pain with certain actions, as experienced by ourselves in our relations with others. This painful feeling we connect, by sympathy, with a similar action about to be experienced by another; and thus we feel that to be unjust towards others is that painful thing which we would have felt it to be so, if experienced by ourselves. Hence morality is, in essence, a 'refined selfishness'—if such a word must be used. We are just or kind to avoid the *reflected pain* which the sight of injustice or unkindness, offered to others, is by a providential law made to cause to ourselves. Of course we do not mean to say that this law of sympathy determines the law of right and wrong. On the contrary, it is what it is because the law is what it is. It is a part of our natural constitution, which teaches moral distinctions, as involving a law of retribution in relation to such distinctions. In the impression of Macintosh that the 'common sense' of Reid and his immediate scholars, contains the germ, and indeed a large portion of the philosophy of Kant, we fully agree. Upon this head we shall say more; our meaning being of course merely to point out that there is something in common between two theorists whose names are rarely associated. We may, perhaps, put Kant and Berkeley through the same process; at present, however, our business is with Macintosh, on whose dissertation we must say a few words more.

We have already indicated as a blot upon this otherwise beautifully written tract, that it leaves us in a state of incertitude as

to the real creed of its author. The objections to the doctrine of pure moral disinterestedness, in the extreme sense of the word, seem to be present to his mind, especially in his remarks on the theory of Clarke. On the other hand, we find him praising Stewart and Dr. Thomas Browne, evidently on account of the support which they gave to what may be designated the *unselfish* theory. These things cannot, however, and do not, consist. There is no medium between the two; and hence this apparent hesitation of the essayist, where hesitation cannot find any legitimate room, acts upon the mind of the reader as a discord does upon the ear of a musician. The essay is palpably out of tune. There is, every now and then, painfully apparent that which in harmonics is termed 'a wolf.' If Sir James is in accord with one, he is at discord with another; but he appears to endeavour, as musicians do, to *distribute* this impression, and we sometimes see him chime in with one extreme, and sometimes with the other, as it may happen. It may, perhaps, be said he was not bound to give any final decision. Perhaps not: but we may add our perfect assurance that of all his readers there is not one who has not wished that he had been so bound.

There remains one other objection to the plan of this essay to be noticed. It is, perhaps unavoidably, too limited. In metaphysical science, as in all other branches of knowledge, the divisions are arbitrary. Nature does not admit them. It is hard to say where the vegetable kingdom ends, and where the animal begins. Thus it is in metaphysical inquiry. By limiting his tract to ethics proper, Sir James, perhaps unwittingly, disabled himself from taking a complete view even of that subject. Ethical science cannot, in fact, be wholly kept apart from more general considerations. The two will intermingle; and as one proof of this we may revert to the long controverted question of 'the freedom of the will,' which, though a part of general metaphysics, yet mixes itself with the question of morals. Into this intricate matter the limitation self-imposed by Macintosh has forbidden him fully to enter. He alludes to it in his concluding reflections; but as a controverted question he leaves it intact; and yet he must unquestionably have been aware that there exists a large class of thinkers who insist upon a 'philosophical freedom of the will'—whatever that may be—as a necessary component of all moral acts, and whose grand objection to 'philosophical necessity' resides in the assertion or assumption that it is subversive of all morality and all accountability. There is no doubt in our mind that Clarke, in laying the foundation of his moral theory in a conception of the 'fitness of things'—and apart from all considerations of the divine will, either in one way

or another, fancied that in so doing he evaded the arguments first elucidated by Hobbes, but afterwards more completely demonstrated by Jonathan Edwards. In this he no doubt deceived himself, and it is probable that Macintosh was of this opinion, but his limits have prevented him from showing that Clarke was here in error, as far as any evasion of this doctrine is concerned; and hence, in this point of view, the dissertation is imperfect, even on a question of morals, from which the other question cannot be dissociated.

To the embarrassment, caused by the intermixture of this knotty question with his immediate theme, may also probably be attributed that which, to a modern reader, will appear the most palpable deficiency of this tract—that is to say, the absence of any proper notice by its author of the peculiarities of German metaphysical philosophy. Into this field Sir James excuses himself from entering, on the score of lack of space. It would, indeed, have opened a somewhat wide expanse for dissertation; and this his readers must even at that time have felt—and so feeling, the omission must, at the period when the essay appeared, have been a subject for regret. At this day, however, it is doubly so. The public mind, little versed, of late years, in psychological inquiries, has been impressed with a notion that in the philosophy of Germany the perfection of metaphysics is alone to be found. All that has been done by the illustrious body of English inquirers, whose writings on these subjects graced the last two centuries, is contemptuously pushed aside to make way for these new comers. The French metaphysicians, down to the commencement of the nineteenth century, are treated after the same arrogant fashion; and those who would know, aught of the science of mind are referred at once to the school of Kant and his successors, as alone worthy of being studied by those who would try to know what man is, or is not; what he can, or what he cannot, do; and what is, or is not, the real nature of that world in the midst of which he is placed. These are questions which, in an age devoted to physics and mechanics, are deemed by the many either incapable or unworthy of an answer. But no considerate mind can thus judge of them. A period for re-action must come, when the mechanism of mind may be deemed just as interesting and important as that of a steam-engine, and when the excogitation of a mental principle may excite as keen a curiosity as the exhumation of a fossil mammoth or megatherium. We are of opinion that the religious excitement at present evidently in progress over Europe, may ultimately tend to this result. This, in our humble opinion, is no subject for regret. We shall never mourn over that revolution which shall help to exalt mind above

matter; and it is under these impressions, and with these views, that we propose, in some slight degree, to supply the deficiency to which we have adverted, and to hazard a few remarks on the German school and its professors.

An examination into the claims of any system of philosophising, naturally divides itself into two portions. We are to inquire, first, is this philosophy original, and how far? Next, we must ask, if it be original, how far is it valuable? In the few observations which we are tempted to make upon this subject, we shall follow this order of inquiry. If, then, we investigate the origin of the German school of metaphysical philosophy, as founded by the celebrated Professor Kant, (for it is with this that we have to do,) we arrive at this view of it. Taking the whole range of metaphysical inquiry, from its first dawnings until a period is arrived at close to our own times, we come to one or two, or more general conclusions, which serve as a sort of landmarks. We find that men early arrived at the notion of two sorts of existences—matter and mind. Upon this notion we find built various modifications; and round it we discover to be hung various doubts. We discover the sublimed but fanciful intellect of Plato tending to something in common with Mani, and treating matter, in some sort, as the Manicheans did, as a sort of ‘evil principle.’ On the other hand, we also come upon inquirers who discard the system of two sorts of existence, and who attempt with Democritus and Epicurus to construct a universal materialism out of one mode of existence. Upon these attempts to explain what matter is, and to account by its means for all phenomena, we also find doubts thrown by others: and hence ‘Pyrrhonism,’ which early denied the validity of any inferences as to external things from our own sensations, and essayed to involve all in that chaos of scepticism which modern times have seen revived, especially by Hume. Out of all this we may, we believe, deduce one fact; that fact being—that although doubts innumerable and scepticism indescribable as to the true nature of existence abounded, no philosopher expressly and unhesitatingly denied the existence of an external world, until the extraordinary genius of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, dared to conceive, to compose, and to publish his treatise on ‘the Principles of Human Knowledge.’ The much misunderstood, and as we are willing to believe, the deeply maligned Benedict Spinoza, about the same period, *all but* did this. Spinoza, however, did not do it. His works were overwhelmed by the hostility of men who either could not or would not understand them. In the meantime, the amiable Berkeley, a genius just as likely to be misunderstood and vilified as was Spinoza, boldly placed his theory

before the world. It convinced few, scandalized some, and astounded most. It remained, however, unanswered, a monument of the subtlety and audacity of the human intellect. But, though unanswered, it was not unheeded, and the equally subtle genius of Hume soon attempted to twist the principle of Berkeley into an instrument in favour of a universal scepticism. He confounded the recipient with the ideas received; and by jumping to this absurd conclusion, tried to resolve everything into a bundle of sensations, inexplicable in origin as in end.

The foregoing sketch is of course a mere sketch, and hardly that; but it affords a faint outline of the general position of metaphysical science, as left by Hume and his followers, and as taken up, *amongst others*, by Kant. In this state it was certainly somewhat of a puzzle. Locke, postulating an external world, had succeeded in persuading mankind that all they knew of that world was obtained from without themselves, by the instrumentality, and through the medium, of simple sensation. All intuitive knowledge he denied, and called in question the possibility of such a thing as an abstract or general idea; except as a result of the knowledge which has its beginning in sensation, and is reacted upon by reflection. Berkeley at one blow had lopped off Locke's postulate. He limited all human knowledge to that of its own sensations. The external world was to him a mere *gratis dictum*; an assumption; a dogma unsupported by any logic that could be admitted. Hume had insidiously followed this up by asking, if the sensations and ideas be taken away, what have we left? Cause and effect he resolved into a mere sequence of ideas, denying that we have any conception of them beyond this.

To a mind like that of Immanuel Kant, the sceptical hue, which the subtle sophistry of Hume had succeeded in impressing upon all mental philosophy, must have been very repugnant. In his great aim as a speculator, Kant was assuredly the reverse of a sceptic. No man ever more sincerely eschewed doubt and grasped at certainty. He found all metaphysics, as he deemed, steeped in uncertainty. The principle of Berkeley, which states that, beyond what is derived from our own sensations, we can have no knowledge, properly so called, he found to be impregnable. If, then, admitting this, he also admitted with Locke, that all knowledge was obtained *ab externo*, or from without; and that the mind was passive in receiving, and only active in apprehending and retaining that which was received, it followed at once that the mind's knowledge is only a knowledge of ideas impressed upon it. That it has no activity to acquire knowledge, being passive in all save mere sensibility, or the power of

feeling sensations and ideas. But this embraced the conclusion that, in such case, an external world was absolutely unknowable: and Kant was not prepared to deny or abandon all created existence but his own, which no man can abandon nor deny. Out of this gulf he accordingly sought a way; and at length deemed he had found one. By dint of long reflection, Kant convinced himself that all knowledge is *not* from without. He assumed for the mind an active power. He asserted that a portion of our knowledge—and no small one—is obtained from within; by the mind's active power of searching for, finding, grasping, and appropriating, certain classes of ideas, necessary to be known, but only thus to be known. The particular ideas thus obtained he undertook to specify. We cannot recapitulate them, for they are many. To some two, or three, we may have to refer. Suffice it, at present, to say, that by this means he deemed he had arrived at certainty, both with regard to external existence and to portions of the powers of the human mind, beyond any knowledge which the mere contemplation of phenomena or sensations can possibly afford. All phenomena he resolved into mere sensation; and sensation proves nothing beyond itself. But in the active power of the mind he held a key was obtained, unlocking the mystery of the *noumena*, or external existences, by which the phenomena were caused. This key resides in the knowledge obtained from within, esoterically, as it were, of certain truths, abstract and general, but so connected with the *noumena*, or external existences, as to lead irresistibly to the inference and admission that such things must be and are.

This is the best condensation which we can achieve of the leading peculiarities of this celebrated system. We have not wilfully misstated any point. We trust we have not unintentionally done so. As the exposition stands, we hold it cannot fairly be accused of 'mysticism.' To our own mind it is perfectly clear. If not mystical, we must, however, call it dogmatical; nor do we see why the followers of Kant should object to this. We only use this term because the points cannot be logically proved. They may be true;—but of these truths we can only become aware by finding them true of our own minds, and by self-examination. Kant's doctrine must be *felt* to be true. It cannot be *proved* to be true by logical process. In this sense, therefore, it is dogmatical. If believed, it must be so, because it is self-evident to the believer, or he must believe it upon trust on the assertion of another,—as a dogma is believed by all, except in the case of the first assertor.

We now, however, come to the main question: Is this method of Kant an original method? In part, we answer, it may be so;

but it would be difficult to show that there is any very material difference between it and the 'common sense' of Reid, the Scottish opponent of Hume. Reid clearly apprehended the same difficulty that Kant perceived; nor is his way of meeting it very dissimilar. Kant held that he found in the human mind a power to discover and apprehend certain classes of truths, unknowable by means of evidence, and impossible to be arrived at by ordinary processes of reasoning. Reid held that the human mind included in itself an intuitive power to judge of the truth or falsehood of certain propositions when brought before it; this judgment being instinctive and not arrived at by a consideration of proof or evidence of any kind, adduced in the ordinary way of logical demonstration. Hence Kant decided against Berkeley and Hume, upon the strength of an asserted power to see truths independently of the ordinary methods of arriving at the knowledge of truth. Hence Reid decided, as Kant did, against Berkeley and Hume, upon the strength of an asserted power of judgment, independently of the ordinary foundations of ordinary judgment, in ordinary cases. The difference between Reid and Kant, then, is, that one asserts a new power to *discover* truths; the other, a new power to *judge* between what is true and what is false. Both asserted powers lead to the same results, or nearly the same. In their conclusions Kant and Reid will be found nearly to agree. The originality of either, as compared with the other, does not thus seem to be great. If results are the test of value, the value of the methods are probably equal.

If we admit, to the fullest extent which his followers could wish, the originality and truth of Kant's psychological doctrine, we still come to the question of its *value*. Admitting it as true, we yet demand, what do we *gain* by it? The disciples of the philosopher assert that he discovered in the mind a power to perceive certain truths, and to come to certain conclusions *a priori*, and independently of any process resting upon experience. The knowledge derived through the medium of the senses he held to be uncertain, variable, and inferior: in short, as a sort of knowledge requiring to be corrected by that more certain knowledge which the mind acquires solely by its own energy, and which is the knowledge of universals. Now is this asseveration correct? Will it not be found, by close examination, that the power which this philosophy arrogates, only amounts, upon its showing, to a power of deciding dogmatically and *a priori* upon the truth of certain propositions as they stand, and to nothing more? Let us take an instance. Kant asserted the truth of that general proposition which predicates of the human will that it is 'free.' He admitted that this truth could not be arrived at by any reasoning founded upon the experience of facts, or upon an examination of

the phenomena of this or that man's will. This he admitted; but asserted, that by the activity of pure reason we perceive the truth of the universal proposition, 'All men's wills are free;' and we then prove the particular by the general; 'All men's wills are free.' Cornelius is a man; *therefore*, the will of Cornelius is free. Now all this may be admitted to be correct, and yet there is ample room to ask WHAT is arrived at, after all? The truth of the freedom of the will? No. Not so; but the truth only of a proposition which, in words, affirms it. We have established a verbal *formula*. *Cui bono?* For of the meaning of the term or phrase 'freedom of the will,' we have no clearer perception than we had before. It is no answer to this to say that this freedom cannot be proved by evidence. It may not be capable of logical proof; but if it be perceived, why can it not be defined? The difficulty, hitherto, of the advocates of free-will has been to give an intelligible definition of that for which they contend. The question we ask is, Has the philosophy of Kant helped the advocates of this doctrine to escape this difficulty: or, Have the advocates of Freewill, who are Kantians, any clearer idea of the bone of contention than they have who are its advocates but who are not Kantians? If this question, as we believe it must be, shall be answered in the negative, then comes the other question—What, then, in this instance, is the value of this philosophy?

If we were to extend this process to other questions we should be met by the same results. If, for instance, we take the words 'duty,' 'time,' 'space,' as expressing what are termed 'general ideas,' and not with reference to particular duties, times, or spaces, we shall find the German philosophy enunciating, dogmatically and *a priori*, the truth of certain *formulae* of other words appended to these single words. This philosophy tells us that the verbal propositions which affirm 'duty is a reality,' 'space is a reality,' and 'Time is a reality,' are true: not because it can prove them to be true, but because it perceives them to be true. Still the question remains, What is the value of these perceptions? Does the perception of the truth of these verbal propositions include a clearer perception of duty, time, and space, than men have who are not German philosophers—or does it not? If it do not, where is the gain? If it do, why not favour us with improved definitions of these terms? Surely that which is perceived may be defined and described.

We have acquitted Kant of the charge of being a mystagogue. The aim of this extraordinary man is, we admit, perfectly manifest and intelligible. His at once subtle and powerful mind grasped at absolute certainty, as to questions with regard to which certainty had not been attained. This certainty he could not

attain from without, and he endeavoured to find it within. He convinced himself that various truths, inscrutable by any process of demonstration, may be directly perceived by the intellect that steadily and faithfully contemplates them; or, in other words, that abstract truths are self-evident to him who uses, in viewing them, the pure reason which God has given him, and trusts to that reason. This may be delusion, but it is hardly to be termed mysticism, though it has led to much that comes fairly under that denomination. If we acquit Kant himself, we cannot acquit all his followers. This philosophy, as taught by its author and his successors, has unquestionably led to a series of innovations in language, which appears to be ending in the establishment of a sort of modern 'Euphuism,' or totally novel style of talking and writing, not only on philosophical, but on ordinary subjects. Now there exists a set of men, beyond all doubt, who love that which is cloudy and mysterious for its own sake, and own an elective attraction towards vague phraseology, misty dialectics, and an exalted and tumid, but nebulous generality of expression. Ixion embraced a cloud because he thought it Juno. These men embrace their Juno purely because she is a cloud. To such spirits the style peculiar to the German school of thinkers and talkers has a charm irresistible. They love it even as they delight in the dreamy poetry of Ossian or the versified metaphysics of Akenside. It is deemed sublime because, according to the prescription of Burke, it is compounded with a portion of the obscure; and pleases as moonlight pictures do, because their light is less, and their shadows deeper, than sunlight will permit. It is the propensity of such temperaments to exaggerate: and thus, as this style becomes more common, in that precise *ratio* will it be found to become more unintelligible. As the painter who determined to outvie Rembrandt, finished at last with a composition which was all *chiaro-scuro*, so transcendental literature threatens to end in something which may literally be termed a 'darkness visible.' Now against this we must take leave to protest. 'Ex fumó dare lucem' may be an apposite motto for a gas-lamp, but hardly for a philosophical school; and sure we are that the man who labours to clear language of its ambiguity, will go to posterity with a passport better than his who struggles to obscure it.

We cannot, within the space allowed us, pretend to notice the modifications by his followers of the doctrines of Kant, nor must we, in quitting the subject, appear to call in question either the talent or earnestness of the modern school of metaphysics, as constituted by those who hold generally his doctrines. We are well aware that this school has produced some virtuous and magnanimous thinkers. Why should it not? a strong persuasion of

the truth of subtle abstractions extends itself, and renders more vivid the perception of truths, more limited in application, but more important in practice. Let us, however, guard ourselves—for this is all we wish to do—from inferring the truth of his tenets from the character of the teacher. For it is a truth, although a sad one, that many a man has drawn comfort from a false religion, and been exalted and sustained by a philosophy itself destitute of foundation. We only object to this philosophy, that it has, in our humble opinion, somewhat mistaken its road. It has looked for a certainty which cannot be found, and stigmatized as idle assumption much that is undeserving of such a stigma, because it cannot be brought within that category of certainty which is unattainable. These are the extremes of doctrine. Inferences may be irresistible which cannot, in the sight of a rigorous logic, be held to be positively certain; and a perpetually increasing probability may at last come to equal, in force of conviction, the power of demonstration, or the light of intuition. Would it not be better then to avail ourselves of such certainty as we have, and when demonstration and intuition fail us, to be contented with evidence, of which the cumulative power may induce conviction almost as strongly as could demonstration itself?

No sane mind ever doubted of its own existence. No sane mind ever doubted of its own identity, because the mind being a unit, and not a composite, the certainty of its own identity is a part of its essence. This consciousness of identity cannot be severed from the consciousness of existence. It is perfectly easy to imagine other minds to exist which, as far as knowledge, memory, feeling, and character are concerned, shall be *fac-similes* of our own; but we cannot, for a single moment, conceive such *fac-similes* to be ourselves. We cannot do this, because identity is not a composition, or aggregate, but a unit, and cannot by any power of imagination be conceived of otherwise, even for a single moment. But what is this unit? or how shall we define it? It is no aggregate, made up of ideas of extension, solidity, ponderosity, form, or colour. Neither is it a bundle of sensations, a compound of feeling, reflection, and memory, for these things are only its modes, and reside, and are inherent in it, but are no part of it. We can only define it, then, as the rigid and mathematical Spinoza defined it, to be ‘*RES COGITANS*,’ a ‘thinking thing,’ or, in other words, a being of which thought is the attribute.* This definition seems narrow to the ear, but to the

* Should any reader be surprised at this reference to Spinoza, unaccompanied by any allusion to opinions erroneously attributed to him, we most respectfully refer such reader to his works. A perusal of them will prove him the reverse of that, which he has been supposed to be—an Atheist! The best edition of his collected works is that of Professor Paulus, entitled—‘*Benedicti de Spinoza opera quæ supersunt omnia*.’ Jena, vol. i. 1802; vol. ii. 1803.—H. E. G. Paulus, Prof. Ienensis.

understanding it is the reverse, for who can say what discoveries as to the nature of thought are not in reserve? Metaphysicians have hitherto divided it into 'sensation' and 'reflection,' and here they have stopped. No one has attempted to trace the possible modifications of that mysterious principle, which we so designate, upwards or downwards. No one has attempted to demonstrate even the probability of a system of beings, really sentient, ministering in their several degrees to each other, from the lowest conceivable manifestation of sensibility to the highest operations of intellect, and communicating only by means of those superadded ideas of extension, space, time, form, solidity, and colour, the true nature of which has been so often mistaken, and, as it should seem, the true office of which may not have been demonstrated. Metaphysicians seem to have wandered betwixt extremes. Idealism, on one hand, *annihilates all but itself* by sweeping negations. Materialism, on the other hand, builds the triumph of matter only upon the degradation or denial of mind, for that is the real result. In the ripeness of time, it is probable that truth may be found between these two. We may learn to assign to the substance, whose attribute is thought, its true rank and true domain; whilst we find for the material modes a subordinate office, even as the sand interposed betwixt the hand and that which it would grasp, often enables it to seize that which must else have eluded its clutch. Such appears to us the direction in which psychological discovery is to be made. What we can only faintly indicate, future times and future adventurers may achieve. The last thing of which we ought to despair is the progress of inquiry, if virtuously conducted, and with a view to the ultimate improvement and happiness of man.

We are now to conclude, and we must do so with a few remarks on the character of the accomplished person, whose works have given the occasion for the present article. Sir James Macintosh was no ordinary man, but he lived at an era where in the senate, at the bar, and in the walks of philosophy and of general literature, England exhibited a variety and brilliance of genius not often equalled in any age or country. In the House of Commons, eloquence was of more value than it is at present, from obvious causes. Stern necessity then pressed less upon governments, and as necessity did less, persuasion did more. Eloquence, accordingly, abounded. In the Commons were Pitt, Fox, Burke, Sheridan, Grey, Canning, Windham, Romilly, Whitbread, Tierney, and Brougham, whilst Horner and Huskisson were the mouth-pieces of those who styled themselves, *par excellence*, 'political economists.' At the bar were Erskine, Scott, and Law, with various other minor lights. In philosophy were prominent the names of Cavendish,

Dugald Stewart, Watt, Brown, Priestley, and Leslie. Amongst the political strategy of the day, the beautiful sophistries and exalted thoughts of Burke, and the brilliant wit of Canning, were strangely contrasted with the keen sarcasm and originality of Horne Tooke, the light humour of Sidney Smyth, the eloquence of Jeffrey, the reckless intrepidity of Paine, the specious fantasies of Godwin, and the Anglo-Saxon energy and plain sense of Cobbett. With such men as Pitt, Fox, and Sheridan, Macintosh is certainly not to be compared. He could not have led a political party like the first two; nor could he, like the last, have attained and preserved a high place in the world of politics and of letters, in spite of the disadvantages of a defective education, and an indulgence in vices which would at once, and utterly, have ruined a more ordinary man. With an intellect like that of Burke, the mind of Macintosh will as little bear to be contrasted. Even in Burke's most sophistical compositions, we perceive a loftiness of thought and depth of reflection that few men have equalled, and to which Sir James Macintosh could not lay claim. With Canning he had more in common. It is our belief that he was, as a scholar, the better read man of the two; and as a politician and a judge of mankind, it is no compliment to place him above that brilliant and showy, but certainly shallow statesman. But the ready wit, the elegant repartee, and the refined sarcasm of the son of the actress were denied him. For the *coups de Theatre* of Canning he had not the tact, and hence, alone, his inferiority; for in elegant literature, in classical lore, and in truth of thinking he was his superior. Of all his contemporaries, we should say that Sir James Macintosh comes nearest to the excellent Sir Samuel Romilly. Like him he was an accomplished lawyer, a fluent speaker, a polished writer, and a benevolent and liberal thinker, in the emphatical meaning of these terms. Like that of Romilly, his character was so well balanced, as to come nearer to the semblance of perfection than do the characters of men of much greater genius, but less regular and carefully tutored habits of thought. Genius is apt to run into extremes, and to be alternately loaded with exaggerated praises or undeserved censures. With minds more equable but less exalted, this is not the case; and where Romilly and Macintosh missed the meed of praise, they escaped also the shafts of blame, and the reaction of that unmerited hostility, which too often follows triumphs too splendid. As an author, Sir James Macintosh cannot certainly be placed in the van of the writers of his time, but he stands near the head of the second rank. His style is always correct, scholarlike, and elegant; but it wants imagination and graphic power, as well as nerve and strength of expression. If it seldom carries away, it, however, always pleases and sometimes delights the reader. If

never sublime, it is always polished; and compared with the compositions of such a writer, for instance, as Lord Brougham, is a statue of the Parian marble contrasted with some savage sculptures in Scotch sand-stone. As a teacher of those around him, Sir James Macintosh was successful, not because he possessed great store of original thought, but because he fully digested and skilfully condensed a varied supply of intellectual alimant raised and matured by others. Hence his political maxims and theories were never original, nor were his historical views either beyond, or in a direction different from, those of other men. What was to be known he knew, what was good he generally adopted, and what he adopted he always adorned. Beyond this, however, he did not go. New truths and new principles are diamonds in the rough which few have the energy to search for or to find. Macintosh preferred the labour of polishing the gem to that of discovering it; and by the brilliance of his cutting and taste in setting, divided the merit with him who dug it from the mine. As a politician and historian, his most palpable deficiency is the want of knowledge of the modern science of political economy. Of this branch of knowledge, he was clearly almost as destitute as was Canning, and, unlike Brougham, he did not indulge the wretched affectation of pretending to know that which he had never mastered. In the stability of the French 'assignats,' it is manifest he was a believer to the last; and it is equally clear that of the mistakes of Horner, Ricardo, Huskisson, and Peel, as to our own currency, he was just as little cognizant. If this ignorance, however, prevented his doing some good, it saved him, also, from participating in much evil and some folly; and, luckily for himself, modestly averse, as was Lord Grey, from committing himself to dogmas, of which he had no knowledge, he escaped being prominently mixed in the measures of the 'Bullion Committee,' the resolutions and contradictions of Mr. Vansittart, and the heartless monstrosities of Mr. Malthus. In fine, as an author, Sir James Macintosh must always stand high, but far from the highest. His works ought to be a part of our libraries, though a minor part. By the old, however accomplished, they must always be read with pleasure. By the young, however gifted, they must ever be perused with advantage. As one of those who, by the judicious use of admirable acquirements, have contributed to civilize the minds and advance the liberties of their countrymen, he must ever rank; but not amongst those mighty few can he be placed, who, by the demonstration of a great principle, or the discovery of a new truth, have exalted human nature itself, and conferred benefits, until then unthought of, upon mankind.

ART. II. *The Covenanters in the North of Scotland: or Sketches of the Rise and Progress, north of the Grampians, of the great Religious and Social Movement, of which the Covenant of 1638 was the symbol.*
By ROBERT KING. Aberdeen: George and Robert King. 1846.
12mo. pp. 400.

THE small and rocky island of Iona was the spiritual light-house of the north, in the sixth century. It was the seat of the missionary college of Columba. To one of this great man's devoted corps, Machar, or Macarius, the only legend we have on the subject ascribes the planting of the gospel in the north-east of Scotland. Instructed by his master to found a church when he should reach a river whose windings formed the figure of a bishop's crosier, the missionary pursued his course eastward and northward till he reached a spot which is now associated with the early life of the unhappy author of 'Childe Harold.' It is the mouth of the Don, near the 'Old Brig,' over whose parapets the bard was wont to gaze, with a mysterious fear that the old rhymer's prophecy might be fulfilled in the crumbling of its arch under the feet of 'a mother's ae son.' There Machar founded his church, which, from its situation, was called the Church of Aberdon, but which has preserved his own name in the designation of a large parish. The Druid was still in the land, and human sacrifice bled on his cruel altar. But the darkness and its cruelties disappeared gradually before the light of the Gospel. The legend, it will be observed, 'bears the impress of a later age. The 'Bishop's Crosier' betrays another mind than that of the great Culdee. But there is no improbability in the supposition that the tradition is founded on fact.

Another band of Culdees founded an establishment in a sequestered valley in the neighbouring county of Banff. Of its history we know little or nothing; but it became a bishop's see in the eleventh century. Malcom II. encountered the Danes at a short distance from it, in 1010. Compelled to retreat, till he found his army pent up by the contraction of the vale and the narrowness of the pass, he performed some rites opposite the Culdee chapel; rallied and roused his troops, and gained a signal victory. 'Spiritus sancti operante gratia, divinum augere cultum cordi concipiens,' says Fordun; Malcom converted the chapel of Mortlach into a cathedral, and founded a bishopric. Another account makes the establishment of the see of Mortlach fifty years later. In 1125 or 1139, David I.

translated the bishopric to the church of Machar, at old Aberdeen. For centuries the old Culdees had been degenerating from their former comparative simplicity and purity; and in the reign of this zealous votary of Rome, they were absorbed in the bosom of the great spiritual power which was then fastening its yoke on the Christian nations of the west.

The most ancient of the Scottish burghs cannot date their privileges higher than the age of David. With the most ancient as well as the most important ranks the burgh of Aberdeen, situated on the Dee, a little to the south of the pretty rural village which boasted the presence of the first Culdee church of the district, and was afterwards a bishop's see. 'Long before Edinburgh had acquired the precedency of a capital, or even the first place among the four burghs of southern Scotland, while Glasgow was yet an insignificant dependent on the bishop, Aberdeen had taken its place as a great and independent royal burgh, and a port of extensive foreign trade.' There are few chapters in the history of religion more interesting and important than that which relates to this place, and the large district of which it has been the capital for many ages.

The four centuries which preceded the Reformation were 'dark ages' in the north of Scotland as elsewhere; but their history is not a dreary blank as is often supposed. It is peopled with living men, acting and acted upon, and exhibits many interesting phases of human condition and character.

The 'Acts of the Apostles' of those times are not only extant, but are now accessible to all who choose to wade through two Quartos of mid-age Latin.* They are filled with bulls, charters, contracts, infestments, and instruments of all sorts; inventories of books, jewels, furniture, and sacerdotal vestments; necrologiæ, or calendars of the obits and anniversaries of saints; bishop's rentals, assedations of church lands, and 'such like.' We have a lectionary containing some portions of Scripture, to be read on certain Sundays, prepared by Bishop Dunbar, in 1529, and we have an ample 'Ordinatio Chori,' containing directions for all manner of turnings, bowings, and genuflexions. The inventories of the cathedral of old Aberdeen, dry and barren as they seem, are instinct with interest and instruction. They extend from 1436 to 1559. Take the first of them as a specimen. We have, (1) a catalogue of books on theology, containing the large number of forty volumes, including two complete copies of the Bible, and three incomplete, some of the works of

* *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis: Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Aberdonensis regesta quæ extant in unum collecta.* 2 vols. 4to.—Printed by the Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1845.

Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, and Augustine, and several volumes of sermons on the saints; (2) books on canon law, fifty-eight volumes; (3) books on civil law, nine volumes; (4) books for the choir, 26 volumes; (5) books for the common service of the choir, sixteen volumes; (6) missals, twenty volumes; (7) the ornaments for the great altar, twenty items; (8) vestments for the great altar, sixteen items; (9) caps, nineteen items; (10) ornamental cloths of the church, twenty-two items; (11) jewels, forty-four articles, including cups, crosses, crucifixes, boxes and cabinets, containing bones and other relics; * (12) furnishing for the altar of our Lady, six items; (13) for the altar of the blessed Michael; (14) for the altar of the blessed John; (15) for the altar of the blessed Catharine; (16) for the altar of the holy Catharine; (17) charters and other documents, eighty-one items.

It needs neither penetration nor philosophy to infer from such a document the character of the worship and of the worshippers of those times. Nor did things improve down to the date of the last inventory we have, in the year preceding the establishment of the Reformation. Its multitudes of caps, and chesabells, and tunicles, and stoles, and fannons, and albs, and amites, and paruts, with its banners and its crosses, its crucifixes and curtains, and vails, betray the pomp and circumstance of a carnal and unchristian worship; and yet this system, 'Cui lumen ademptum,' enjoys the warm sympathy of the editor of the 'Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis.' 'The church acted,' he says, 'on the avowed and consistent principle of inspiring piety by an appeal to the imagination and the heart.' 'Subservient to that end was the munificence directed—ad-augmentandum cultum divinum—ad-decorem domus Dei—to make 'more glorious the service and the fabric of the church, not as 'a mere place of popular instruction, or a convenient meeting-house for devotion, but regarded by the old Catholic, as by the Jews of old, as the temple and very shrine of a present Deity, 'where innumerable altars were offering up the ever-renewed 'sacrifice of propitiation.'

In our simplicity, we find it difficult to reconcile the 'avowed and consistent principle' of the church with the principle of the great ancient who valued five words spoken with and to the understanding, more than ten thousand in an unknown tongue; and as difficult to acquit of impiety the attempt to renew on innumerable altars that sacrifice of propitiation which was offered, once for all, on the cross.

* The Aberdeen Cathedral boasted of having in its possession some of the garments of the Virgin Mary, some of the bones of Peter and Paul, and even the 'bones of the Patriarch Isaac!'

The Bishops of Aberdeen reflected their system in their persons and their acts. Not the humble and laborious instructors of the people, they were rather the companions of kings and barons, and often discharged the functions of chancellors and of ambassadors. We find one, indeed, '*Vir magnæ honestatis*,' who carried the asceticism of the convent into the episcopal palace, and even made the visitation of his diocese on foot; and another, who was a distinguished scholar, courting the acquaintance of all who were eminent for ecclesiastical learning, and who, desirous to reform the manners of the people, preached and exercised his episcopal functions through all parts of his diocese. But these successors of Peter and Paul were in general busied about many things of a very different kind. We find them for ever engaged in the assertion of their temporal rights, and in all manner of disputes respecting them. One has a commission for ascertaining, by different inquests, what hospitia and hostilagia belong of right to the bishop in royal burghs and manors. Another is chiefly busied through life in rendering effectual his claim to second tithes, the fruitful subject of dispute for centuries between the Bishops of Aberdeen and the men of their diocese. One appeals to the law against his neighbouring diocesan, regarding their respective rights in churches near their '*marches*,' '*limites terrarum*;' another takes the sword to recover the woodlands of some of the higher districts from the hands of wicked highlanders, '*improbos quosdam montanos*,' whose devotion to their Holy Mother was by no means shocked by appropriating a portion of her spoils to themselves. One converts the revenues of a neighbouring hospital to the maintenance of the episcopal table, and the support of two chaplains. Another obtains two bulls, granting indulgences to all who should visit his cathedral in devotion, and contribute to the erection of its nave.

Let him who can, trace the likeness of the Apostles of Jesus Christ in these 'successors,' and whoso cannot discover their moral identity, let him confess that they were not the ministers of the same faith. Or, if any man hesitate, he has only to read, first, the '*Acts of the Apostles*,' and then ponder the '*Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*.' In what part of the latter shall we find the counterpart of Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus?

Were we writing the history of the times to which we are referring, we should give due prominence to two men who stand out from their fellows: not, indeed, in their faith, or in anything proper to the episcopal office, but in useful labours of which all succeeding generations have reaped the benefit. We refer to Bishop Elphinstone, who founded the university of King's

College and the Bridge of Dee, and Bishop Dunbar, who completed his predecessor's noble undertakings.

'Like priest, like people,' during this long period: sins against the church were unpardonable, but sins against the moral law could be compensated by money. On the 26th of March, 1451, the clergy and people of Aberdeen obtained a bull from Pope Nicholas V., granting a licence to prosecute the salmon fishing on Sundays and festivals, during the five months in which those fish frequented the coast, on condition that the first salmon caught on each Sunday and festival should be paid to the fabric of the parish church.* And, when priests and people united in the follies which were practised after solemnities on *Holy* days, to relax the bow which had been painfully bent, like the farce which follows the tragedy elsewhere, the priests obtained a bad pre-eminence, and required the restraint of municipal authority for the 'letting and stanching of diverse enormities.'†

The attachment of the people of the north to popery was very strong, and no one could divine the nearness of the great change which, within a few years, gave, at least, a new face to society at large. So early, however, as 1525, when the German Reformers had only just abandoned the mass, and the cause of the Reformation was clouded by the war of the peasants—two years before the Scottish proto-martyr, Patrick Hamilton, preached the truth in his native country, and expiated the crime at the stake—twenty-two years before John Knox was called to the public ministry of the new faith—some scattered rays of light had insinuated themselves into the darkness of the north, and awakened the jealousy and fears of Rome's priests and watchmen. The king, James V., writes to the Sheriff of Aberdeen and his deputies in the following terms:—"Forasmuch as it is 'humbly meant and shown unto us by a reverend Father in God, and our trusty counsellor Gavin, bishop of Aberdeen, 'that whereas sundry strangers and others within his diocese of Aberdeen, have books of that heretic Luther, and favour his errors and false opinions, contrary to our act of parliament lately made in our last parliament; our will is herefor, and we charge you strictly, and command, that soon as these our letters are seen, ye publish the said act at all places needful, and take inquisition if any persons be found within the said

* This book furnishes us with a few instances of the cool presumption wherewith these representatives of God upon earth, could modify and relax the laws of the Almighty. After acknowledging the Sabbath to be separated from all servile work, "tam veteris quam novi testamenti pagina," the bull of Nicholas proceeds:—"Tamen Romanus Pontifex . . . modificat ac in parte relaxat prout id novit salubriter expedire!"—Registrum, Ep. Ab. i. 257.

† Burgh Records, 30th April, 1446.

‘diocese of Aberdeen that have such books, or favour such errors of the said Luther, and that ye confiscate their goods, and inbring the same to our use and profit, after the form of the said act as ye will answer hereupon.’*

Bishop Gavin Dunbar, to whom we do not deny the rare honour of having promulgated the truth, that the prelates of the church were ‘not the masters of the patrimony of the cross, but its guardians and administrators,’ did not live to mingle in the storm which was soon after raised by the opinions against which he thus invoked the royal arm. He died in 1531, and was succeeded by Bishop Stewart, whom we find, in 1540, associated with Cardinal Beaton at St. Andrew’s, in the trial of Sir John Borthwick, who was accused of maintaining that the pope had no greater authority than any other bishop—that indulgences or pardons granted by the pope were of no force or effect, and other heresies. The next bishop was William Gordon, fourth son of the Earl of Huntly, and was consecrated in 1547.

The Reformation had now made considerable progress in the south, parliament having five years before made it lawful to read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. And the north could no longer be secured by a bishop’s seal against the truth. Nothing remained but to turn the weapons of the Reformers against themselves. Argument, that dreaded thing, must be attempted. Preaching must be revived. But the measures which indicated the fears of the priests, indicated their impotence likewise. In the first year of his episcopate, the new bishop and his chapter ‘admitted Master John Watson as a preaching canon, though without prebend, in a remarkable deed, setting forth—the greatness of the harvest and the scarcity of labourers—the spread of heresy and heretics, and the necessity of supplying the food of the Word of God to their confusion and the safety of the Christian people—the insufficiency of the bishop to preach in all the parishes of his diocese; and the necessity of supplying his place with men fit for preaching the Word of God, hearing confession, enjoining penance, and all else that pertains to the safety of souls. The new canon was bound to give two lectures on theology weekly, in the cathedral, and to preach once a month to the people, and once in every year to visit and preach in each of the common churches of the chapter.’† But other and better under-

* Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1398—1570. Printed by the Spalding Club, 1844—page 110, August 14, 1525. We have modernized the orthography of the king’s letter, and we may state here that we do the same to some other documents we have occasion to quote.

† Regis. Ep. Ab. Preface, vol. i. page lix., and vol. ii. 317.

stood means of resisting the encroachment of the new faith were not neglected. The bishop introduced a clause into the feu-charter of the church, obliging the feuar to defend the rites and liberties of the holy church, and resist all heretics and impugnors of the true faith.

The awful fact cannot long be concealed, however, that the storm is not to be averted even by such means. The southern portion of the kingdom is already lost to Rome, and something more must be done for ‘stanching of heresies pullulant within the ‘Diocie of Aberdeen.’ In his distress the bishop appeals to his dean and chapter for advice, and they give it freely. Their memorial (dated apud Aberdoniæ quinto Januarii, 1558) contains so striking a portrait of the Roman Scottish Kyrke, painted by her own hands, that we would give it entire but for its length.* It justifies all that has been said of the dark and corrupt state of Scotland in the age which immediately preceded the Reformation.† ‘Imprimis,’ the chapter advised, ‘That my ‘Lord of Aberdeen cause the Kirkmen within his lordship’s ‘diocie to reform themselves in all their slanderous manner of ‘living, and to remove their open concubines, as well great as ‘small, under sic pains as is contained in the law, and acts ‘provincial; and the chapter of Aberdeen shall do sichlike ‘among them in all sharpest manner, conform to the law, as ‘well on themselves as their servants or any other persons ‘dwelling under their jurisdiction. Item, for preaching to be ‘made within the hail diocie that there be sent letters monitory ‘upon the hail personis, abbots, and priors to cause preaching ‘to be made within their kirks, betwixt this and Fastern’s Eve ‘next, at least once in ilk parish kirk and another time betwixt ‘that and Easter, with continuation, conform to the acts provin- ‘cial, under pains contained thereunto: and failing thereof that ‘my lord cause send a preacher to every ilk kirk that is not ‘preached in Lentron thereafter; and to take up the pains ‘thereof to be applied to certain preachers to be sent through ‘the diocese; and letters to be directed thereupon, upon the ‘fermoraris thereof, conform to the statute provincial; so that ‘the people be not in danger because of inlack of preaching of ‘the true catholic faith.’ The chapter recommended at the same time the enforcement of the statute of residence on the clergy, and that a summons be issued to all parties suspected of heresy, or absenting themselves from church and mass.

* Reg. Ep. Ab. I. lxi—lxv.

† “The corruptions by which the Christian religion was universally debased before the Reformation, had grown to a greater height in Scotland than in any other nation within the pale of the Western Church.”—See M’Crie’s Knox, Period First.

Such parties to be examined as to their sentiments on the sacrament of the altar, and the power of the church, and to be tried by the bishop, in presence of Lord Huntly, baillie of the bishopric of Aberdeen, or in the vent of his absence, in the presence of 'some principal landit man of his lordship's kyn' who should be 'in reddiness in his lordship's place, as he is 'requirit for assistance.' Measures were likewise urged against parties who were connected with the 'casting down of images,' and 'curings to be executed solemnly thereupon at the market 'crosses of New and Old Aberdeen.' The memorial concludes most naively and instructively,—'And that the premissis by the 'help of God may take the better effect, the dean and chapter 'aforesaid humbly and heartily pray and exhort my lord their 'ordinary for the honour of God, relief of his own conscience, 'and weal of his lordship's diocese, avoiding of great slander, 'and because all they that are contrary to the religion Christian, 'promise faithful obedience to the prelates, so that they will 'mend their own lives, and their inferiors conform to the law 'of God and holy kirk; in respect hereof, that his lordship 'would be so good as to show good and edificative example; in 'special, in removing and discharging himself of company of the 'gentlewoman by whom he is greatly slandered; without which 'be done, diverse that are partners say they cannot accept 'counsel and correction of him who will not correct himself; 'and in like manner, not to be over familiar with them that are 'suspected contrary to the kirk and of the new law; and that 'his lordship avoid the same; that when his lordship pleases 'to visit the fields to repose himself, he choose such company 'as offers till his lordship's own estate; and cause his lordship's servants to reform themselves, because next himself it 'seems him to begin at his ain household. Which premissis 'being done, the said dean and chapter believes in God that all 'shall come well, to the honour of God, and general reformation of the haill diocese of Aberdeen; and they promise to his 'lordship their hearty concurrence and assistance with honour, 'service, and obedience to their utter power.'

In preparation for the storm, Bishop Gordon set his house in order, not by repentance and newness of life, but by consigning to the care of the canons (in 1559) a portion of the cathedral plate, jewels, and vestments, of which the 'Registrum' contains a curious inventory. Although the reformed religion was established by the Scottish parliament in 1560, Gordon retained his see till his death in 1577. The advice of the chapter seems to have been lost upon him, and we find him, in 1565, with their own consent, granting a charter of the lands of North Spital in

life rent to Janet Knowles—probably the ‘gentlewoman’ (as the Spalding editor ventures to suggest) by whom he was greatly slandered.

Notwithstanding the acknowledged attachment of the north to the old system, the Reformation, in its external profession at least, met with little opposition on the part of the inhabitants generally. We find an entry in the Burgh Records, under date 4th January, 1559, which exhibits society resolved into its elements,—constituted authority acknowledging the natural right of the people to self-government, and making its appeal to this ultimate earthly source of power, and acting on its decisions. ‘The said day, the whole town being warned, it was expounded to them by the baillies, by the speech of David Mar, one of the baillies foresaid, and treasurer of this good town, elected for this present year, how that certain strangers, and some neighbours, and indwellers of this burgh, have entered the Blackfriars and Whitefriars of this town, and spoiled their places, and taken away the gear and goods of the same.’ The work of ecclesiastical spoliation still proceeding, the question submitted to the ‘whole town’ was, ‘if they thought it expedient to preserve the timber, slates, and stones, and the same to be intromitted and applied to the common works of the town for the common weal and utility thereof, together with the crofts, lands, and emoluments, that belonged to the said friars, and the profits thereof to be applied to the common weal of the town, and specially for the forthsetting of God’s glory, and his true word, and preachers thereof, and that the town may be more able to concur and assist for the defence of the realm; expelling of strangers, and suppression of idolatry.’ With one exception, the assembled townsmen answered in the affirmative; and the resolution was peaceably carried. Four days after, the provost, who had been absent, protested against the act of the people as ‘manifest treason,’ but in vain.* It was not to be undone. And to the same great tribunal, ‘the whole people,’ must the appeal be made ere long in some shape or other, as to the continuance of the present religious establishments of the country. That the question may be settled as peaceably and promptly as it was by the assembled people of Aberdeen, is the devout prayer of those who love both church and state, but hold it as a

* The chief magistrate belonged to the family of Menzies of Pitfodels, a family which adhered to the Roman-catholic church till its extinction by the death of the late John Menzies of Pitfodels, in 1843. We shall find one branch of the family, however, occupying a prominent place, and acting an important part in the reformed church. It may be worth stating that the family residence of Blair, four miles from Aberdeen, has been occupied for years as a Roman-catholic college, by the gift of the late proprietor.

religious principle, that they fulfil their several functions best in a state of legal separation and independence. We can only mention the dates of the principal ecclesiastical changes which took place in the succeeding age. Popery was abolished and the reformed doctrines recognised by act of parliament, in 1560. In 1567, the protestant church was established and endowed. For thirty-two years it had a mixed episcopal and presbyterian form of government, but presbyterianism proper was established on the 5th of June, 1592. Within a very few years, however, 1597, episcopacy was again insinuated through the instrumentality of the general assembly of the church, in consequence of the intrigues of King James VI., and became, though in a modified shape, the established form of government by virtue of various acts of parliament in 1597, 1606, and 1612.

Such was the nature of the protestant establishment in Scotland when Charles I. ascended the throne in 1625, and such it continued to be down to the famous Assembly in Glasgow, in 1638; which, in the face of the proclamation of the king's commissioner, to dissolve and disperse under the pain of treason, utterly abolished the episcopal office, with all traces of the hierarchy, and erected on its ruins the presbyterian platform of government by kirk sessions, presbyterian synods, and general assemblies.

The covenant adopted in the beginning of this never-to-be-forgotten year, and signed first by the people of Edinburgh, in their Greyfriars church and churchyard, is the starting point of the interesting work which we have placed at the head of this article. The author's aim is to exhibit the rise and progress, north of the Grampians, of the great religious and social movement, of which this national instrument is the symbol. 'While there is scarcely a noble, baron, burgess, or minister,' (he remarks in his preface,) 'belonging to the southern portion of the kingdom, who took part in the great struggle, who has not been assigned a niche among our Scotch worthies, or whose name is not still familiar, as a household word in the mouths of the people, and in the popular literature of our country; we seldom hear of Andrew Cant, well known in the north two centuries ago, as the apostle of the covenant, and whose rude, but fiery eloquence stirred the spirits of our forefathers, as he urged its first subscription from Aberdeen to Inverness; or of David Lindsay, the bold parson of Bethelvie, who bearded the assembled barons of the clan Gordon, and their cavalier associates; or of the benignant, noble-minded and devout Provost Jaffray, and his pious friend, the Laird of Brodie; or of Ross, of Kincardine; Fraser, of Brea; or Hogg, of Kiltearn; all of whom lived and

'laboured, or suffered, north, of the Grampians. Besides furnishing notices of these and others, of whom the glimpses are less frequent, our local annals supply chapters in the History of the Covenant, peculiar to the only part of the country which met its first advances with the most determined opposition of its learning and its chivalry, furnishing at once themes for the student of great principles, and scenes, for the lovers of the picturesque, more rare in the history of the south.' Mr. King has done justice to his subject, and produced a work of much value and deep interest. It will be read with satisfaction by those who are best acquainted with the solemn times and events to which it refers. The author has brought to his task the only state of mind in which that task could have been properly discharged, a chastened and enlightened enthusiasm. He is imbued, we shall not say with the liberal spirit of modern times, but with Christian love of freedom and truth. He does not blindly 'extenuate' the imperfections of the Covenanters, neither does he 'set aught down against them in malice,' but looks at them with the fond love of a large soul, and from the only point of view in which their prejudices and short-comings can be treated justly and honourably. Of their oppressors, at the same time, he can speak calmly, while he speaks indignantly. But we write of our author as if he were still one of ourselves on earth. There is something deeply affecting in the statement with which the preface of his book concludes:—'Thus far the author: it falls to another pen to state that he is now beyond the reach of criticism. His work was written in the sick chamber, which had been his home, with few intervals, for eighteen months. On the 5th of November, he committed the charge of superintending the last few sheets of it to a friend, and on the 20th he entered into rest. In these circumstances, his friend must be allowed to say, that the warm sympathy, with spiritual and evangelical religion, which pervades the following history, was not the assumed tone of authorship, but the sincere breathing of his own inner soul. Evangelical truth was the foundation of his character in life, and of his hope in death; and his memory will long be fondly cherished by all who knew and could appreciate his warm heart, his intelligent piety, and literary taste—a taste cultivated amid the pressing engagements of business.' It was fitting that so much at least, should be said of one who could produce such a work in such circumstances.

What now, we should be disposed to ask, was the real state of the people in the early times of the Reformation? Where did Roman catholicism hide its proscribed head, and how did

it preserve its life when hunted both by the civil and spiritual powers, in a way, too like its own, though less violent.

On these topics the Spalding Club has put us in possession of much information, not a little of it novel and romantic, but we must forbear using it at present. Nor can we dwell on the singular wars of doctors with doctors, and soldiers with soldiers, amid which the covenant was enforced on the reluctant north.

We leave these in the hands of our author, who has narrated them with much spirit, and hasten to a portion of history which is not a little curious, and cannot fail to interest all who revere the memory of the priests of civil and religious liberty. It is so much associated with the life and character of one man, that we must make his biography the thread of our tale.

Alexander Jaffray was born in Aberdeen, in 1614, his father having frequently been chief magistrate of that city and its representative in the Scottish Parliament. Young Jaffray's education at the university of his native city was interrupted by his marriage, at the age of eighteen, to the niece of the principal. Shortly after his marriage, he spent a few weeks in Edinburgh, where he became intimate with his relative, Robert Burnet, afterwards Lord Crimond, father of the celebrated Bishop of Salisbury. Burnet was a man of such piety and strictness of life, that, although in the subsequent troubles he adhered to the Royalist party, he was generally called a puritan. In the company of this good man, Jaffray had occasion to hear and see some good things, not only respecting legal matters—which appears to have been the main object of his visit—but some things as to the practice of holiness and charity, especially of observing the Sabbath-day,* for the neglect of which his relative often challenged and reproved him.*

Subsequent travels in England and France, enlarged his mind, and contributed to fit him for the important part which he afterwards acted in the affairs of his country. On the visit of the commissioners from the Tables, in 1638, the elder Jaffray was one of those who signed the covenant; and ever after, from their position in the burgh, both father and son were among the first to feel the rude visits of the cavaliers, and had frequently to go into hiding.

The events of 1644 illustrate the difficulty of administering justice in disorganized and violent times. Jaffray acting as a magistrate, found it necessary to commit a servant of the Laird of Haddo to prison for riotous conduct, and thereby excited the Laird's wrath. Waiting an opportunity, Haddo attacked him

* Covenanters in the North, p. 300.

shortly after 'for his life,' about twelve miles from the city. 'After some strokes had passed between us' (says Jaffray), 'he left me wounded in the head, and my brother John in the arm. He fired two pistols at me, one after another, being then within twice the length of his horse from me; both of them misserved; whereat he was in great fury, alleging they had never done the like before. And that same night, in Old Aberdeen, to try them if they would misserve again, he put out the candle, at which he shot.' *

Jaffray prosecuted his assailant and had him severely fined, but Haddo soon found the means of revenge. Early on the morning of the 19th of March, of that year, a party of sixty horsemen, headed by the offended Laird, galloped into town, surprised Jaffray and his brother, and other two magistrates in their own houses, and carried them to Strathbogie, and imprisoned and treated them with great cruelty for seven weeks. The good man's wife survived his capture only three or four days. 'I desire, upon every remembrance of her,' (he says in his diary,) 'to be thankful to the Lord who so ordered me in my choice; though I was then so ignorant, that I remember not if I sought it of him—but his goodness in this, as in many other things, did prevent me.'

'In September, 1644, Jaffray appeared in arms with his townsmen, in their attempt to oppose the entrance of Montrose and the Irish. Lingered on the field after the flight had commenced, and being 'evilly horsed,' he had well nigh fallen into the hands of the most savage portion of the invaders; but escaped, saving a pair of the covenanting colours. For some time after the battle, while the country was in the possession of the Royalists, he found refuge with other covenanters, in the castle of Dunnottar. One day, on returning from a visit to Crathes, in company with his brother and Andrew Cant, the party were encountered by the young Laird of Harthill, on his way home from the battle of Kilsyth. Harthill's party, after threatening to kill Jaffray and his companions, especially the brothers, owing to their connexion with the fate of Haddo, carried them prisoners to the garrisoned house of Pitcaple. There they were confined for five or seven weeks, and their keepers, though a company of vile, profligate men, 'carried themselves civilly towards them'—some of them, indeed, attending their private exercises of devotion; while on the Lord's day, sometimes all of them were present, and had something like convictions at the hearing of the word which was preached unto them with much boldness and freedom by Mr. Cant.'—*Covenanters in the North*, p. 304.

In 1646, he was appointed on a committee of parliament for

* Diary of Alexander Jaffray, edited by John Barclay, London, 1834, p. 21-23.

proceeding against malignants and delinquents, and we find him afterwards confessing the unwarranted zeal with which they executed their functions. In 1649, he was one of the parliamentary commissioners who negotiated with Charles II., then at the Hague, for his restoration to the Scottish throne. In the following year he was put on a new parliamentary commission, to treat with the king at Breda. But his heart revolted at a business by which, as he expressed it, 'we, [the commissioners] did sinfully both entangle and engage ourselves, and that poor young prince to whom we were sent, making him sign and swear a covenant, which we knew, from clear and demonstrable reasons, that he hated at his heart.'

'The infatuated passion for the restoration of Charles he attributes to the failure of the Solemn League in England, and the consequent ascendancy of the English sectaries, by whom there was likely to be set up a lawless liberty and toleration of all religions; and the fond hope that the accession of a covenanted king would prevent this deluge and overflowing scourge. 'But,' he exclaims, 'how has the Lord overturned all these contrivances and devices of men's wits for upholding their own devices and inventions!—his work, and the glory of it, being, as of another kind, so to be brought about in another manner. This we might have seen, had our eyes been opened; dear bought and precious experience gives us now to know it.'—*Covenanters in the North*, p. 311.

Jaffray appeared on the field of Dunbar with the soldiers of the king and covenant. But after being severely wounded, he was taken prisoner and carried into Cromwell's camp. This was the crisis of his history. He records himself that he was treated with great kindness and courtesy. During his captivity he was in constant and friendly intercourse with Cromwell, Fleetwood, and Owen, and then 'first had made out to him, not only some more clear evidences of the Lord's controversy with the family and person of the king, but more particularly the sinful mistake of the good men of this nation, about the knowledge and mind of God as to the exercise of the magistrate's power in matters of religion, what the due bounds and limits of it are.'

On his release he committed his thoughts to writing, but often proposed to suppress the paper till 'the clear discovery of the thing was so made out to him that he could not contain,' and he submitted it to Andrew Cant, John Row, John Menzies, three of the ministers of Aberdeen, and to John Moir, a pious merchant.

Andrew Cant was now his father-in-law. Well known as the apostle of the Covenant in the North, his rude but fiery clo-

quence (as our author has it) had roused the country from Aberdeen to Inverness to subscribe that famous instrument. He listened to his son-in-law with indignation. Row and Menzies heard him patiently, although they joined at the same time in a series of instructions regarding the public resolutions, the first sentence of which is, 'We doe all look upone the sectarian party as ane enemie to the work of God, and ane unjust invador of this kingdom, against whom acting is a necessar deutie.'*

Jaffray could now find no rest. Not in the spirit of disputation, but of a perplexed and humble inquirer, he went to Edinburgh in the same year (1651), where he found fifty or sixty ministers and others earnestly discussing 'the very thing about which he was desirous of inquiring'—namely, 'the causes of the Lord's controversy with the land.' It was a meeting of Protestors. They had under their consideration the sad defection of the majority of the church in supporting the public 'Resolutions,' by which the covenant was practically set at nought, and the church convulsed with the most heart-rending divisions. 'It was in the perversion and desecration of their great instrument of reforming the church and kingdom, that these good men saw the national sin. Jaffray was inclined, with fear and trembling, to give that name to the instrument itself, as an unsuitable and unscriptural method of promoting the kingdom of Christ. He had begun to think that swords, even in the hands of saints, are no part of the armory of truth.' And he returns to his home as he left it.

But he could no longer be satisfied with the avowal of his opinions—'he must act upon them.' 'Some Christians in Aberdeen,' he says in his diary, 'men and women, having for a long time been convinced of these things, (long before ever I thought of them was with me),† found themselves obliged to

* See Row's *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland*. Appendix, p. 531. Published by the Wodrow Society.

† 'Long before ever a thought of them was with me.' This interesting fact deserves some illustration. The materials are indeed scanty, but they are the more precious. They are almost all to be found in Spalding's *History of the 'Troubles in Scotland.'* Under date, Sept. 6, 1642, Spalding writes—'About this time there came in quietly to Aberdeen one called Othro Ferrendale, an Irishman, and a skinner to his calling, favoured by Mr. Andrew Cant, and by his moyan admitted freeman. He was trapped for preaching on the night in some houses of the town before their families, with close doors, nocturnal doctrine, or Brownisme, as was said, of whom ye may read more hereafter.' Andrew Cant's alleged favour for Brownism is opposed to all his *known* sentiments and proceedings. But he and Samuel Rutherford, and others, defended private conventicles or family meetings, a subject which was discussed in a very fierce and disorderly manner in several assemblies, especially that of Aberdeen in 1640. See Baillie's *Letters*, i. p. 248—255, where also will be gathered how Brownism, so called, came out of Ireland. In

‘endeavour to have the ordinances administered in a more pure way than there was any hope ever to attain, to have them in a national way. But before we would conclude to do anything of this, it was thought necessary, first to impart our purpose to some Christian friends, and to be willing to hear what they could object against our resolution.’

‘Such a community, in such a position, was a singular phenomenon; and few people at this day can conceive its complete isolation. It was the product, however, of very apparent causes, to be found more remotely in the character of the age, and more proximately in those private meetings which had found shelter under the wing of Andrew Cant himself. To what extent the presence and preachings of Cromwell’s troops, who arrived in the town about this time, increased the party, it were now vain to inquire. There is no doubt that their

October of the same year, Spalding says, ‘Great business about Brownisme, in the assembly, lately crept into Aberdeen, and other parts in the country, practised by William Maxwell, Thomas Pont, and Othro Ferrendale, preaching in some houses upon the night, as was alleged. Mr. John Ross, minister of Birse, was complained upon, and Gilbert Gordon, appearant [heir] of Tilliefroskie, that he, his wife, children, and servants, and hail family, had dischaunted his parish kirk of Birse, and had his devotion morning and evening within his dwelling-house. He being conveyed, appeared and answered for himself, and said it was true whilk the minister had spoken; and further declared, that the religion he professed was the only true religion; whereupon they demanded him of certain points of religion, whereupon he made his own answer, nowise to the contentment of the brethren; and therefore they ordained his minister to process and excommunicate him, in case of disobedience. Sundry townsmen of this sect are suspected. Mr. Andrew Cant and Mr. John Oswald, were thought no great dislikers of it; for, by the said Mr. Andrew’s moyan, Ferrendale was made freeman, as ye have heard before. In the end, the brethren appointed a committee of a minister and ruling elder out of ilk parish of this presbytery of Aberdeen, to convene at Aberdeen, the 8th of November next, for trying thir matters.’ Again:—‘Ye heard before of Maxwell and Ferrendale accused of Brownisme. Mr. Andrew Cant favours them, as thought, whereat the brethren were offended, ordaining them to come in before the pulpit, and subscribe the covenant, and deny their tenets; but upon Saturday, after sermon, and the last of December, this Ferrendale came in before the pulpit in the old kirk, where he approved of our church, denied the Brownist tenets, subscribed our covenant, and by Mr. Andrew Cant was received as a good bairn; but the brethren were not content with this satisfaction, not done upon a Sabbath day, but a week day, before the communion.’—January, 1643. ‘Ye heard before of Othro Ferrendale, his repentance. The presbytery of Aberdeen were not well content therewith; whereupon, Dr. Guild, moderator, wrote for two ministers and ruling elders out of ilk presbytery within the diocese, and the hail ministers of the presbytery of Aberdeen, as being nearest hand, to meet at New Aberdeen, the 24th of January, for taking order with the slighting of this Ferrendale in his obedience and satisfaction, contrary to their last act, which bears him to come in upon a Sabbath day after sermon, to deny his hail tenets of Brownisme, swear and subscribe the covenant, ratify and approve our kirk, as the true church of God. The brethren and their ruling members met; Mr. Andrew Cant made his own apology, which was thought frivolous. In the end, they referred this Ferrendale to the next provincial assembly.’ The last notice in Spalding on the subject relates to the young laird of Tilliefroskie, who had fled from the north, and ‘was taken on the Causey of Edinburgh, and warded in the tolbooth thereof, for maintaining some points of Brownisme.’

presence would make the avowal of such sentiments more easy, while the gravity and propriety of their own deportment furnished a practical refutation of those absurd, popular clamours against the holders of them, with which the country had been so rife. 'I well remember,' says Bishop Burnet, 'of these regiments coming to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline, and a face of gravity and piety among them that amused all people. Most of them were Independents and Anabaptists: they were all gifted men, and preached as they were moved. But they never disturbed the public assemblies in the church but once. They came and reproached the preachers with laying things to their charge that were false. I was then present; the debate grew very fierce; at last they drew their swords; but there was no hurt done; yet Cromwell displaced the governor for not punishing this.'—*Covenanters in the North*, p. 319, 320.

The small independent church now formed in Aberdeen, for such it was, numbered among its first members John Row and John Menzies. These were famous men, and of famous descent. John Row was the grandson of the reformer whose name he bore. His grandfather obtained distinction in the practice of the Canon law, and was nominated, in 1550, agent for the clergy in Scotland, for negotiating their affairs at the court of Rome. He remained in Italy for seven or eight years, and acquired a reputation which would have led to preferment, had not the state of his health rendered it advisable for him to return to his native country. The progress which the reformed opinions had already made in Scotland having excited the attention of the Roman pontiff, Row was invested with the character of Pope's nuncio, to investigate the causes and to devise means for preventing the further progress of such heretical innovations. But as his son (the historian of the kirk of Scotland) remarks, he proved a "corbie messenger" to his master, he was soon a convert to the heresies which he came to investigate and to stanch, and continued, till his death in 1680, an able and constant supporter of the great principles of the Reformation.* His son, born in 1568, became minister of Carnock, in Fife, in 1592, and continued there till his death in 1646, steadfast amid all changes, and honoured to suffer in the cause of truth and freedom. The minister of Carnock, in his seventieth year, took part in the great assembly of 1638. And in the assembly of the following year, when the king's commissioners gave warrant that his majesty would ratify their proceedings in the approaching parliament, it is recorded that

* It was the discovery of the imposture practised by the priests at the chapel of the Virgin of Loretto, in the last miracle which was attempted in Scotland, that proved the immediate means of the religious change in Row. The circumstances are related by MacCrie.

‘old John Row, being called upon with teares, said—I blesse, I glorifie, I magnifie, the God of heaven and earth that has pittied this poor church, and given us such matter of joy and consolation; and the Lord make us thankful first to our gracious and loving God, and next, obedient subjects to his majesty’s commissioner for his own part.’

John Row, of Aberdeen, was the son of this good man, and was worthy of his ancestry. He was born in 1598. From 1632 till 1641, he was master of the Grammar School of Perth, and instructed his scholars in Hebrew,* as well as in Latin and Greek. In 1641, he became minister of St. Nicholas Church, in Aberdeen.

But one year before he joined himself to Jaffray and his friends, we find him calling the sectarian party, ‘Ane enemie to God’s truth;’ but the times were sifting and agitating, and we feel no surprise that one year should produce so great a change.

Menzies was connected with the family of Pitfodels, famed in the north for its devotion to Rome. He was one of the ministers of Aberdeen, and Professor of Divinity in Marischal College, a man of much learning and of much popular talent. At a latter period of his life, he did good service in controverting the dogmas and practices of Popery, though as a member of a dominant, and persecuting church, he occupied a false position in waging spiritual war with a proscribed and humbled error.†

The first step taken by this small company of separatists was to draw up a statement of their peculiar sentiments, and of their designed procedure. This document, remarkable as the first proposal to secede from the established church of Scotland, is a pattern of all that is humble, and tender, and affectionate.‡

‘To us it seems (the associated brethren remark) for aught we can search in the word, that none should be admitted as constituent members of a visible church, but such as with a

* Row was the author of the first Hebrew dictionary and grammar printed in Scotland. The title of his grammar is as follows—*Hebrææ Linguae Institutiones compendiosissimæ et facillimæ, in Discipulorum gratiam primum concinnatæ, nunc vero in Iuventutis ubique studiosæ, et eorum præcipue gratiam, qui Theologiæ sacro sanctæ navant operam, in lucem editæ a M. Joa. Row, tunc Moderatore Scholæ Perthanæ nunc vero Ecclesiæ Aberdonensis Pastore.*

† His works are before us, but their titles are too long to be quoted in full. One of them ‘*Papisimus Lucifugus*,’ contains a discussion with Dempster, a Jesuit, 1668. The other, ‘*Roma Mendax*,’ a reply to an anonymous defender of Dempster’s arguments, 1675.

‡ It is in the shape of a letter addressed to the Lord Warriston, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, and others, dated Aberdeen, May 24, 1652, and will be found in the Appendix to Jaffray’s Diary, p. 193. It is signed by Jaffray, Row, Menzies, William Moore, and Andrew Birnie, in name of their brethren.

‘profession of the truth, join a blameless and gospel-like behaviour; as they may be esteemed in a rational judgment of charity, believers, and their children. Such were the churches as founded by the apostles, which ought to be patterns for us, as appears by the titles given to them,—saints, sanctified, justified, purchased by the blood of Christ.’ The document proceeds—‘It is certain our churches were not constituted according to this rule, in the full extent of it; yea, alas! few of our most precious men will acknowledge it to be the rule. But our consciences convince us, that we are under a sinful snare by reason of our mixtures.’ Again: ‘It is far from our thoughts to say the Lord has no church in Scotland; but we must crave leave to say (and, oh, that we had prepared hearts for it!) that the holy ordinances of Christ have been prostituted amongst us to a profane mixed multitude. Yea, and for aught we understand, the rule of constitution of gospel churches has never been so looked to as it ought; and so at best we have but an impure church. And this we speak, without any derogation to those worthy men who were instrumental in our first reformation, whose memory is precious to us; nay, we verily judge, that if those holy men were alive in our times, they would exceedingly offend at us, who have sat down in their dawning light, which had its own mixture of darkness.’

Three days after the date of this important document, Row wrote a long letter to his brother, who was minister of Ceres, happily extant, in which he argues with great clearness and ability, the points on which he and his brethren differed from the Covenanters.*

Alas! for the ‘golden age’ of established Presbyterianism, if this good man’s testimony is to be credited, and it is supported by all cotemporary authority. ‘What one amongst a hundred in Scotland is fit, according to the pattern, to be sett at the Lord’s table? We would not, twenty years ago, countenance a mixed communion, where was kneeling and sitting, two sundry gestures; shall those be countenanced where visible members of the devil are set up for members of Christ’s body? The multitude are encouraged to continue in ignorance, security, pride, profanity, formality, malignancy. Why, they are members as well as others, and there is not a separating the precious from the vile.’ In remonstrating with the separatists, the spiritually-minded Rutherford argued for the admission of the godless multitude to church ordinances in

* See Row’s History of the Kirk of Scotland, Appendix, p. 533.

order to their conversion; and especially to save them from falling into the hands of Jesuits, seminary priests, and other seducers. 'We look upon this visible church (he said) though black and spotted, as the hospital and guest-house of the sick, halt, maimed, and withered, over which Christ is Lord, Physician, and Master; and we wait upon those who are not yet in Christ as our Lord waited upon us and you both.'

The ecclesiastical courts of the province did not overlook these proceedings. On the 30th of June, we find every minister of the synod 'posed,' touching his judgment on the constitution of the kirk. Three ventured to state their minds in the following terms—'We, under subscribers, being solemnly posed by the moderator of the provincial synod, what our judgment is of the present church government and constitution in Scotland, declare that for a considerable space of time, we have been searching, and yet propose further to search, into the mind of God in these things, but according to our present measure of light, we humbly conceive, with reverence to precious, holy, and learned men of another judgment, that there are not to be found convincingly scriptural grounds for our classical subordination with power of jurisdiction in point of censure. As to the constitution, we judge that our sinful mixtures, and promiscuous administration of ordinances, without due distinction betwixt the precious and the vile, is not the least sin of the land for which the Lord is contending with us, but when it shall be more distinctly told us what our rule of constitution is, we shall more distinctly answer to this last branch. *Sic subscribitur*, Mr. John Row, Mr. John Menzies, Mr. John Seton.* Mr. John Seaton was one of the ministers of old Aberdeen. Other four ministers, while satisfied with the Presbyterial constitution of the kirk, declare themselves 'noways satisfied with the present actual constitution and complexion of congregations,' by reason of the sinful mixture of the precious with the vile in dispensing of ordinances, especially the sacrament of the Lord's supper.' No censure is pronounced on Row and his two associates 'till the matter should be advised with the general assembly,' and in the meantime, they are 'exhibited' either privately or publicly to vent any doctrine or practise anything tending towards separation, or against the present government of this church, and

* Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, extending from 1562 to 1681, p. 219, 222. This volume, the gift of Lord Francis Egerton, to the Spalding Club, just published or rather printed, forms a most important contribution to our knowledge of the state of the people, and the internal working of the kirk governments, which existed in Scotland from the Reformation till within a few years of the Revolution.

that under the pain of the highest censures.' On the 21st of October, the synod appoint brethren to confer with these three ministers, who are now spoken of as 'having separated themselves from the discipline and government of the kirk to 'independency.' But the published registers contain no farther notice of the case, and it was happy for the dissenters that the power of the men of the covenant was crippled by the ascendancy of Cromwell.

Long letters from many good men, and repeated conferences with the best and ablest of the covenanters, failed to dissuade Jaffray and his friends from their 'endeavour to have the ordinances administered in a way nearer the institution, and more 'pure in way of administration, than it was possible, or there 'was any ground to hope to have, in the national way,' and in the month of November, 1652, they did together partake of the ordinance of the supper of the Lord, publicly in the meeting-place, called Greyfriars.*

In the same year, Row was made principal of King's College, in room of Dr. Guild, whom the commissioners from the English commonwealth had deposed for his prudent attachment to the royal cause. Jaffray was appointed director of the chancellry for Scotland, and, in the following year, was one of the five Scottish members who took their seats in Cromwell's little parliament. He was one of those who refused to leave the house, till it was cleared by a file of musketeers—an act of independence, which the dictator recognised only by offering him an appointment as one of his judges for Scotland, an offer, however, which he declined.

The Restoration came in 1660, and was celebrated in Aberdeen with the most maddened joy. 'We have in our possession (or, rather had, for they have strayed into the hands of the tribe of book borrowers, who 'pay not again') the sermons preached by Mr. Paterson, before the magistrates and council; and by Mr. Scrogie, at the request of the professors and students of King's College on the occasion; and the language of both is unmeasured. Never was jubilee celebrated with such ecstatic joy; nor can the brightest hour of the millennium be hailed with more exultation. The land had long been covered with a dark night, wherein all the beasts of the forest had crept forth, and luxuriated in savage and indiscriminate rapine. The return of Charles was the dawn of a glorious sunshine, before which all that was foul

* Greyfriars was, and is still, one of the parish churches of Aberdeen. Menzies was its minister, and resigned neither his parochial cure nor his professorship of divinity, while uniting in communion with the Independent church, which he allowed to meet in his place of worship.

and savage had retired into its den to perish. The golden age had certainly returned.

The sufferings which now befel the covenanted church, are the subjects of familiar history. The noble men who suffered in the north, have their names enrolled, and their characters illustrated in the work before us. Nor has our author forgotten those who had left the established communion. And what was their end? We read nothing of them in their collective capacity, but the history of the principal individuals is not lost. Some of them, alas, conformed, as did not a few loud and bold covenanters, and some took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and the injury of their persons. We would throw a veil, if we could, over the conduct of Menzies. We here only record his conformity. His last compliance with the government of the day, alarmed himself; and he became ill, and died in 1684.

His confessions were made public by his own directions, and seemed the utterance of true penitence. 'Though he tread upon me (he said), 'yet will I trust to him for mercy;' and again, 'oh, to have one day in the pulpit of Aberdeen!' 'What would you do?' asked his brother-in-law. 'I would preach to the people the difficulty of salvation.' 'He hoped' (he said), to 'be saved, but so as by fire.' There rests a cloud, but not such a cloud on the conduct of Principal Row, at the Restoration. We lack the thorough manliness and honour which his character would have led us to anticipate. He had never been a republican, indeed, though he adopted the religious sentiments of the sectaries, but he went unjustifiably and inconsistently far in his expressions of loyalty. He resigned his principalship, however, and had the honour to see several of his writings on the questions of the previous period, tied to the market cross, and burnt by the common hangman.' 'Thereafter' (says a chronicler of King's College), he went to New Aberdeen, and took up 'a private school; for he had laid nothing up to maintain himself 'when he was out of place; and, therefore, lived by keeping the 'said school, and for the most part by charity. At last, he went 'to Kinellar, and stayed with Mr. John Mercer, his son-in-law, 'and daughter, where he died about 1672, and was interred.'

But no stone or monument distinguishes the grave of this eminent man from those of the unknown crowd who have found a last home in the same obscure resting-place.

There is inexpressible satisfaction in contemplating a character so pure and single as that of Alexander Jaffray. He was still the devout and noble-minded man he had ever been. In the first year of the Restoration, he suffered a four months' im-

prisonment in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, and was liberated only under a bond of 20,000*l.* not to leave Edinburgh, and to appear when cited. At this period we find traces of a change, which was soon afterwards matured. His record of his 'strivings against sin,' during the solitude of his imprisonment, contains much to edify the most watchful and devout Christian. But deep mental distress soon led a spirit naturally calm and contemplative, and now morbidly affected by a diseased body, into quietism. So that on his leaving prison, he was not altogether indeed, but almost, a Quaker. A month had scarcely elapsed, when he was cited to appear before the parliament, on the 5th of March, 1661, for 'divers matters of treason.' But parliament not happening to meet on that day, the charge was dropped. We find him now visiting Guthrie and Macquarie, and other worthies, who were suffering for conscience' sake, and though always anxious that 'neither weakness nor wilfulness' should lead him astray, the uniform result of his discussions regarding what he had for some time considered a great idol, the covenant, was his establishment in his own views. The last entry in his diary relates to July, 1661, and his resolution then is, 'with God's grace, to endeavour to keep close to Christ, the true light, as he enlightens himself forth in the conscience.'

In the end of the following year, we find his 'convincement' completed by 'the instrumental means' of an English Quaker minister, and his name appears first on the list of a little band who avowed their readiness to bear the cross of that afflicted people. Not a few, both of the higher and the lower classes, both in town and country, withdrew from the communion of the established church, and became the objects of the most vindictive abuse at the hands both of magistracy and populace. Among them, the most eminent were Robert Barclay, the famous 'Apologist of the Society,' then (1665) only in his nineteenth year, and his father, Colonel Daniel Barclay, of Ury, who had distinguished himself in early life in the service of Gustavus Adolphus, and afterwards in his native country. None bore the indignities of the mob—'the dregs of the town who were set on by the zealots of that day'—with greater patience and nobleness of soul than this old and once proud soldier. One of his relations, upon an occasion of uncommon rudeness, lamenting that he should be now treated so differently from what he had formerly been, the worthy man replied that he 'found more satisfaction as well as honour in being thus insulted for his religious principles, than when, some years before, it was usual for the magistrates, as he passed the city of Aberdeen, to meet him several miles, and conduct him to a public

entertainment in their town-house, and then convey him so far out again, in order to gain his favour.'

The Covenanters gave so much work to the government of Charles, in the south, that the Quakers were there little molested. But the Tolbooth of Aberdeen was for years the head-quarters and principal meeting-house of the new sect. Like the Israelites in Egypt, however, the more the Quakers were persecuted, the more they multiplied. Uncowed and unsubdued by imprisonment, they made the streets resound with their exhortations to the everlasting audience that surrounded the grated windows. There was no alternative but to board up the windows, and the poor Friends were packed in cells, in the terms of the chief magistrate's threatening, 'like salmon in a barrel.' But, even thus packed, the gaol became 'too strait' for the multitude, and a partial release became the necessary consequence of every fresh importation, while those thus liberated returned at once to their forbidden courses, and kept up their meetings with courage and patience. We sometimes meet with the ludicrous where we should least expect it. And we have been not a little amused with the following specimen of passive resistance:—A party of Quakers is transferred from the prison of Inverury to that of Aberdeen, at the instance of Sir John Keith, a violent persecutor. It is decided that they shall go to Edinburgh, and make an ignominious progress from shire to shire, like the vilest malefactors. They are brought forth amid the cruel mockings of a vile mob, and traverse the streets amid much indignity. But, once out of the town, an infirm man, finding himself unable to proceed farther, sits down by the roadside. The whole company follow his example; sit down, and refuse to rise till horses are furnished for their journey. The attendant baillie is in a rage, but what can he do? Utterly nonplussed, he returns home to suffer the gibes of his brother magistrates, and the victorious recusants betake themselves to their respective dwelling places.

The estimation in which Jaffray was held rendered him a 'dangerous seducer,' and we weep over human nature when we find his old friend, Menzies, stirring up Bishop Scougal against him, and through him Archbishop Sharpe. In 1664 he was summoned before the High Commission Court, and though he spoke with a mouth and wisdom which all his adversaries were not able to gainsay or resist, he was sentenced to be confined to his own dwelling-house, and keep no meetings therein, nor go anywhere without the bishop's licence under the penalty of a fine of 600 merks Scots. 'It is better to obey God than man,' was his only comment on this unjust sentence. And the

ten years that were still allotted to him were spent amid the sufferings and vicissitudes to which his faithfulness to God subjected him. Cruel imprisonments, even when bowed down with bodily infirmity, moved not the man whose course was the result of 'a real and well-grounded fear of God.'

'You cannot vanquish us,' said his fellow-sufferers in the same cause to their persecutors, 'you will weary yourselves with very vanity.' But there was a term to these things. The wicked must cease from troubling. The good man in whose company we have lingered so long was but in his fifty-ninth year, when he lay on his death-bed at his own mansion of Kingswells. He died as he lived. 'The sting of death is fully gone,' he said, 'and *death is mine*, being reconciled to me as a sweet passage, through Him that loved me.' 'Now, Lord, let thy servant depart in peace,' (was his repeated prayer,) 'for mine eyes spiritually have seen, my heart hath felt, and, feeling, shall for ever feel, thy salvation.' On the 8th of May, 1673, all that was mortal of this good man was quietly laid in his own burial-ground, within a few miles of the city, on whose highest offices he had conferred more honour than he had received from them; but whose magistrates and populace had now tried for years in their zeal to cast out his name as evil. We have been on pilgrimage to the lonely spot, and it is in our mind's eye while we write! No monumental marble marks his tomb. The long rank grass waves on it, but does it no dishonour. We see the avenue of old mountain ash, which, in an almost treeless neighbourhood, tells the ancient date of the house to which it leads. The old Dutch tiles, with their scenes of Scripture story, which still adorn the fireplace of the venerable mansion, are before us. And though we are no Quakers, we sympathize too deeply with all that is pure and sublime in moral action, not to feel that we are treading on holy ground.

Our readers know how great a change was wrought by the Revolution of 1688; but no week passes without obtruding on us the painful fact, that our religious liberties are even yet incomplete.

ART. III. (1.) *The New Timon. A Romance of London.* London: 1846.

(2.) *Poems.* By LEIGH HUNT. *Poems.* By JOHN KEATS. *Songs and Poems.* By BARRY CORNWALL. New Editions. London.

If the amount of genius in any given era could be calculated after the manner of an arithmetical series, we should not hesitate in arriving at the conclusion that it was never greater, in the history of our literature, than at present. The publications prefixed to this article form but a scanty portion of those we might have named, had we regarded them as worthy of such distinction. From the catalogue at our service, a casual observer might imagine, that by those who affirm that the imaginative faculties are in a state of senility, the age had been belied, its spirit had been impugned, and its tendencies entirely misunderstood.

Amidst the strife of politics—the wonders of mechanical invention, which exceed, both in ingenuity and power, the marvels of an Arabian tale and the feats of necromancy—it would not seem unreasonable to suppose that the small still voice of Poetry should be unheard, and that, disgusted with the selfishness and turmoil which she beheld on earth, she had taken her flight, and sought for worshippers in a more genial region. Yet, amidst all this earthliness, it would appear that the pure spirit is still resident amongst us, and that through the gloom of these ‘iron times,’ marks of her radiant footsteps are yet visible. That her track is somewhat indistinct none can deny; but that poetical genius is extinct, or even that it is tending to annihilation, is, as we shall endeavour to prove, very far from the truth. If we had no faith in the progress of humanity, and if we did not cherish the full assurance of its arriving at the lofty elevation which prophecy has foretold, and experience goes far to demonstrate,—we should be ready to despair of the future triumphs of genius, and be inclined to adopt the opinion, that with the master-minds of past ages every great effort had been consummated; and we might run the risk of becoming converts to a theory which we deem as pernicious as it is false,—*That with the increase of civilization there is a proportional decline in the powers of imagination and fancy, and consequently a decay in poetry and the arts—that nations, like individuals, only once in their history appear in the freshness of youth, and in the bloom of beauty; and, that such a period having once elapsed, their further attempts at originality and vigour are totally ineffectual.* But for the reasons we have assigned we are still hopeful. We

cannot school ourselves into the belief, that 'hoar antiquity,' like the insatiate divinity, is destined to devour its own offspring, or bind to one form the Proteus-like shape of genius. We believe *that* to be too subtle for chains—too ethereal for bonds or fetters. We think this view of the subject may be strengthened if it can be shown by a reference to the past, that *The noblest productions of the imagination, and the brightest miracles of art, were invariably the result of the highest civilization of which the age was capable in which such productions appeared.* If it were otherwise, if ignorance were favourable to art, where should we look with greater hope for its displays, than among the rudest tribes of men, and the most uncivilized of nations. Epic poems ought to be found as rife as summer-fruits amidst the retiring glens and sombre forests of New Zealand, or the thirsty wildernesses of Australia. Timbuctoo should rival Athens; and the magnificence of Rome should be eclipsed by the splendours of an Indian wigwam.

The only escape from a conclusion so preposterous is by an admission which, in our apprehension, is fatal to the whole theory. It is allowed, that though men feasoned more correctly in the days of Elizabeth than in the times of Hengist, yet, during the times of the imperious queen, they wrote better poetry; but, while poetry itself was improving, the poetical faculty was in a state of decay. Imagination was more powerful in Alfred than in Shakspeare, though its manifestations were less skilful. In the former, Nature was predominant; in the latter, Art. The whole merit of the immortal dramatist lay in the adroitness with which he managed his tools—the craft with which he built up his materials. Alfred is the more original genius, Shakspeare the greater artist. The imagination displayed in 'Midsummer Night's Dream' or the 'Tempest,' is inferior to that which blazes forth in the black-letter fragments of the patriot king.

Poetry in this sense is not regarded as the pure exercise of the imaginative faculty, but as the result of mechanical dexterity; by means of which edifices of rare beauty and imposing grandeur are erected so cunningly as to conceal the meanness of the materials out of which they are constructed. The very admission is conclusive against the theory. If knowledge be necessary to skilful arrangement of thought, and dignity and clearness of expression; if the language of a country must have reached a high state of perfection before the bard can hope for the successful application of his art—does it not inevitably follow that civilization is not only favourable but essential to the grandest efforts of genius? The theory to which we allude takes for granted that poetry is an object of faith, not of reason—that men must be-

come once more, children, ere they can sympathize with its creations—that judgment or questioning is fatal to it—and that the exercise of the understanding is the death-blow to its advancement. But to our task:

If we adopt the opinion that Homer was really the author of the ‘Iliad,’ we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that this great poem is the production of a mind stored with all the learning and knowledge of an age highly advanced in refinement. If we had no other proof than the exquisite language in which the poet’s imaginings are embodied, this, we conceive, would be confirmation strong enough to the unprejudiced, that the people who used such a polished instrument for the expression of thought and feeling, had progressed far beyond rudeness.

That art had reached to a comparatively high pitch is evident from the descriptions of the poet. Who can contemplate the single instance to which we would allude—one example among hundreds which might be quoted—we mean the graphic and picturesque and glowing delineation of the shield of Achilles, without arriving at this conclusion? Nor is this all. Mere incidental expressions—epithets which, from their frequency, amount in Homer almost to common-places—delineations of character—moral reflections on the nature of man, and the uncertainty of life—dissertations on fate and freewill—go to show very clearly that society in the Homeric times had nearly reached that culminating point which, without the guiding light of revelation and the progressive spirit of Christianity, it was destined never to surpass. It will not, we think, be disputed, that the learning and the philosophy of Egypt, the arts and the commercial enterprise of Phœnicia, were known to the inhabitants of Ionia in the times of Homer. His great poem furnishes indisputable proof of this; and we are aware of nothing which can militate against the opinion, that this illustrious genius was the product of an age of the highest culture, preceded by generations of gradually increasing civilization.

The Iliad, therefore, affords the first proof that *A period of great refinement is not inimical to the successful exercise of the imaginative faculty.*

But upon this point our proofs are cumulative. The whole literary history of antiquity, almost without exception, is corroborative of our theory. In the ruder ages of Greece, both tragedy and comedy—(if mere ‘extemporal diversions,’ neither written nor published, nor preserved, are entitled to the appellation)—were of the simplest kind, only choruses of men and women singing their extemporaneous songs, as Maximus Tyrius informs us, through their several districts. But with advancing civiliza-

tion, Thespis arose, who may properly be termed 'the day-star of the drama.'

It is questioned by some, whether any of his rude and irregular compositions were ever committed to writing; though his graphic representations, like the songs of the more ancient rhapsodists, may have been preserved in the memories and imaginations of the sensitive Athenians. By Thespis the genius of Greece was roused. Pratinas, Carcinus, and Phrynichus successively followed him, and led the way towards the sublime grandeur of *Æschylus*.

The Greeks, glowing with patriotism, and hence with the love of country, with irresistible might swept the Persian from their native soil, and saved it from the contamination of despotism. The effect was electric. The mind of a whole people was propelled in an onward direction, with a rapidity and a power of which the history of the world affords no other example. Athens, as if by some magic influence, rose from her ashes into beauty and splendour. The arts found an asylum within her walls. The muses made the gorgeous city their favoured home. The heights of Helicon were deserted for the banks of the Ilissus: and dubious oracles no longer pealed from the temple of the Delian god, but flowed in serene wisdom from the lips of philosophers, in the groves of Academus, or beneath the galleries of the porch.

At such a crisis, in such an era almost without a parallel for refinement in the history of antiquity, the most sublime of the Greek dramatists appeared.

In *Æschylus* the imaginative faculty, so far from being oppressed by the so-called effeminating influences with which he was surrounded, seems to have gathered strength from their ameliorating tendency.

Standing on the glittering summit of an age so brilliant, his mighty genius precipitated itself into the dark and dreary abyss of a past world, and returning like the fallen angel from his successful flight, he dragged before the eyes of his astonished audience the super-human beings of a lost universe, the heaven-defying Titans—proud, gigantic, fierce, indomitable.

The very obscurity of the style of this great writer has frequently appeared to us as the effect of consummate art. His personages are more than mortal, they belong to the most powerful of the ancient race of gods, and the labouring fancy of the poet strove to clothe them with a mightier drapery, and gave their thoughts a deeper meaning than degenerate man could effect, or human utterance could furnish.

His defects—for what work of mere art is perfect?—are those

of his age;—he stood between two eras, and was to a certain extent subject to the influences of both. His poetry embodies the strength and rudeness of the one, with the brilliancy, though not with the refinement of the other.

The tide, though nearly at the full, had not yet reached its highest mark; a more fortunate genius, who was silently borne along its waters, was destined to gain that eminent position, and to experience the happiest influences of his age.

Sophocles, if not the contemporary, at least the immediate successor of Æschylus, is without doubt the greatest and most perfect of the ancient dramatists.

The whole history of this poet reminds us of a fable. It seems as if the fairies, and the fortunate deities had presided at his birth, hung over his cradle, endowed him with every excellence, and promised him every talent that should lead to eminence, and render life long, and prosperous, and happy.

The scion of a noble and wealthy house, his education was the completest of his times. Born at a period when art was super-eminent, and philosophy possessed its greatest masters—he had every advantage which that brilliant state of which he was a citizen could furnish. His genius, which was naturally sublime, was refined by the most cultivated taste—his style is severely correct, his characterization natural, and the construction of his plots simple and ingenious. In the writings of this great poet, the plastic art of dramatic composition runs parallel with that of painting and sculpture.

Xcuxes and Phidias seemed to have excited to noble rivalry the muse of Sophocles, and while the works of these masters have perished, or are left to us only in fragments, the immortal verses of the bard remain, to tell posterity how excellent were the productions of his renowned contemporaries.

Sophocles was the exponent of the cultivation of his age—the highest development of which it was susceptible. With Euripides both the virtue and the genius of Athens began to decline. A period of senility—a second age of ignorance, was about to commence. The great cycle so remarkable in all the states of the ancient world, as far as regarded Athens, was accomplished, and she too must submit to the stern law of decadence. The conservative, the progressive influence of Christianity, she never felt, and the grand element of regeneration being absent or unknown, her fall was rapid—her resuscitation impossible.

If we carefully examine the whole literary career of Greece, whether we regard her poetry, her philosophy, or her art, we cannot fail to discover that her greatest excellence in each and all of these departments runs parallel with her highest stage of

refinement. Her lyric poetry forms no exception to this. The graceful strains of Anacreon—the sensuous and burning passion of Sappho—the sublime soarings of Pindar, are all the products of a cultivated period.

The literature of the Romans was entirely imitative. They never aimed at originality. Their earliest poetry, the *Fabula Atellanæ*, a species of bantering comedy, was common to them with every nation in a state of rudeness. It was a sturdy stock, but no healthful or wide-spreading branches sprung from it. The ballads of the ancient Romans, if they possessed any, were apparently of little value. They may have laid the groundwork of fabulous history, but they never sank deep enough into the minds of the people to induce their preservation, or to influence the literary men of those days to collect and arrange the scattered relics.

The love of power among the ancient Romans, left no place for the love of song. A nation always in the field had neither leisure nor opportunity to cultivate the arts of peace. The pomp of a triumph had greater charms in their eyes than the poet's crown and the grateful acclamations of an enlightened people. So much for their early history. But at last the world was conquered, and Rome, satiated with victory, and overladen with the plunder of a hundred kingdoms, required excitement. The Euphrates and the Rhine, the deserts of Numidia, and the mountains of Caledonia, were too remote, as theatres of action, to rouse the tyrants of mankind from their terrible repose. The period of forming a national literature was, however, past. Rome was the common receptacle of all nations; and thus, while her empire was established, her nationality was lost. Yet she had reached the period of her greatest refinement, the acmé of her civilization, before her great, if not her original poets appeared.

The transcendent merits of Virgil and Horace are so generally acknowledged, their influence on the taste, the manners, the education of the most enlightened nations of modern times, is at this day so universally felt, that the most glowing eulogiums on their merits, if we were to offer them, would be perhaps properly regarded as mere commonplaces. If, however, the cultivation of the intellectual powers be inimical to the efforts of the imagination, the history of Roman literature forms a remarkable exception to the rule; since the most philosophic of their poets is by far the most imaginative, and approaches nearer to the character of an original writer than any other that Rome has produced. After these remarks we need hardly mention the name of Lucretius. Every scholar knows, that for grandeur and elevation of thought, majesty of diction, intense love of nature, and pic-

turesque description, this writer has scarcely an equal among the poets of antiquity. The subject which he has chosen is unfortunate, and greatly at variance with the character of poetry; but in his hands it becomes flexible. He moulds with ease its most untractable parts into forms of grace and beauty, and throws over the whole a pomp and splendour of language, and a brightness of colouring, which mark a genius of the very first order.

Along with the decline of Roman virtue, and the progress of despotism, the literature of the times naturally deteriorated. With Juvenal, the great satirist of antiquity, the poetical glories of Rome may be said to have expired. Yet though we admire the bold, and fiery, and indignant declamation of the poet, we cannot but perceive that in what constitutes the true elements of his art he is deficient. His exposure of the enormous vices of the times, though they strike with horror, fail to improve. To learn the lessons of purity we are introduced into a brothel; and that we may detest the cruelty of imperial monsters, we are presented with the spectacle of mangled carcases, and arenas saturated with the blood of murdered victims.

The poet partook of the spirit of his age. If he possessed strength, he had neither taste nor judgment to rise above its influences, and his works resemble a lurid light on the verge of a stormy horizon, the harbinger of gloom, and tempest, and utter darkness. We therefore think it beyond dispute that the appearance of Rome's greatest poets was coeval with the period of her highest refinement. It matters not that the literature of such a people was borrowed, and not original, or that they claimed the learning of conquered nations as their own, and appropriated the intellectual wealth of the vanquished to their special purposes,—the fact is demonstrable, that during the Augustan age, when Rome's empire was universal, and her civilization most advanced, her genius was most luxuriant, and her imaginative works most perfect.

A period, dreary and barren, succeeded the decline of Roman greatness. Liberty had perished, or was the inheritance of nations far beyond the reach of Rome's insatiable ambition. The genius of freedom, driven from the genial regions of the south, found shelter among the snowy mountains and far-stretching forests of a northern clime, there collecting her strength to renovate mankind, and infuse new vigour into the effete and worn-out frame of the ancient world. It would be wrong, however, to suppose that the period which elapsed between the sixth and eighth centuries, in Europe, was one of total darkness. Along with the fall of the western empire there was a new element infused into society, which in its nature was

essentially progressive. This was destined to give vitality to its institutions, and breadth, and depth, and refinement, and originality to its literature.

Christianity, the true regenerating principle of the world, was that element; and its ameliorating influences soon became manifest. Contemporaneously with the crusades, the poetry of the Provençals bloomed forth in the richest luxuriance—a literature of itself, novel, fresh, original—the proper elements of which were ardent feeling, glowing love, heroic valour, and melting tenderness; a combination of qualities which at once marked it as the offspring of a principle entirely alien to the lyrical effusions of antiquity. This was the heroic age of the modern world. During its short, though energetic existence, the materials were collected and the foundations laid of those structures of romantic beauty and inimitable gracefulness which were to point ‘their pinnacles heavenward,’ and bear upon their fronts the impress of immortality in a more refined and a more intellectual age. Hitherto the learning of Europe was confined to a dead language, and its spirit evaporated in servile imitations. The vital principle escaped, while the laborious fabricator was connecting the disjointed members of his rigid forms. His efforts ended in vain attempts to unite the dead with the living. The burning ardour of populations, young and vigorous, could not suffer the restraint, and finding no way of escape, no vent to their feelings through a general literature, they roused themselves into the frenzy of religious zeal, and, with the force of an avalanche, precipitated their myriads upon astonished Asia. The result, though calamitous to the invaders, was beneficial to mankind. It gave a quickening impulse to all Europe, and with the return of the Crusaders, a degree of refinement was introduced, which, running through all its manifestations, especially that of chivalry, ended in the production of a Dante, a Petrarch, a Boccaccio, and a Chaucer.

It would be incorrect to say that the great Florentine was the product of a barbarous age. The Italian triumvirate we have mentioned, embraced the entire humanity of a cycle, which may be regarded as the first in the history of modern civilization. The sublime, and solemn, and daring mind of Dante, though deeply imbued with a love and veneration for classical antiquity, was too strongly tinctured with the spirit of that age to bend to a foreign yoke. The poet, it is true, claimed, and we think justly, the rich treasures of the past as a common inheritance, but he stamped them with the impress of his own genius. Of all modern writers he is the most original. His transcendent poem stands like some lofty rock amid the solitary ocean, its

base dashed by the dark and sullen waters, its centre encircled with clouds of purple and gold, and its summits towering far into the blue empyrean, radiant with eternal splendour! Dante was the exponent of the concentrated learning and refinement of his era, the type of the highest cultivation of which it was susceptible. The same may be pronounced of Petrarch and Boccaccio.

After these writers, a long century of apparent lethargy intervened, till the appearance of Tasso and Ariosto gave evidence that the quickening element was still present, and that progression was henceforward to be the destiny of our race. From Italy we might pass to Spain, and trace a like advancement in the literature of that country, till it arrived at superlative excellence in the creations of Cervantes, and Lope de Vega, and Calderon; the last mentioned poet being the apex of an era which for learning and philosophy has not since been approached in the history of Spain.

Nor will the sister country form an exception. Camoens sung when Portugal excelled in enterprise and empire, and the '*Lusiad*' forms an enduring monument of the learning and civilization of that country during the times of its illustrious author.

If for a moment we pause in our course, and compare the poetry of antiquity with that of the moderns, we shall at once perceive in what the difference consists.

No people were more devoted to their country, or more wedded to their institutions, than the Greeks. Their self-love was unbounded. They regarded every other people with scorn. They imagined that no excellence could exist beyond the beautiful region of which they were the possessors. On this point their sentiments were more nearly allied to the inhabitants of Serica, than to the large-minded liberality of the Caucasian race. To strengthen this prejudice, they resorted to fable and fancy. They inculcated the belief that they were the original natives of the soil, that they sprung from its bosom, and were pre-eminently the favourites of the gods. Yet, with all this, their poetry is less national than it is universal. It has more breadth than depth. It is ideality materialized. It is enamoured of repose; and if at times it betrays emotion, as we find in some of the dramatic pieces of *Æschylus* and *Euripides*, it is of so gigantic—we had almost said so unnatural a cast, as to defeat the purpose of the poet, by failing to excite the sympathy of the reader. Moreover, the poetry of the Greeks is peculiarly sensuous. For this it is easy to account.

The picturesque beauty of the territory in which they resided—the almost perpetual splendour of their climate—the glittering

seas that bathed their bold and varied shores, and murmured around 'their purple isles'—the lofty mountains—the deep glens and long withdrawing valleys—the olive-crowned hills—the time-hallowed fountains—and the tumbling cascades which perpetually met their sight as they looked from the Acropolis, or gazed from the summit of the flowery Hymettus—impressed their imaginations with a sense of beauty which transferred itself spontaneously to their works of art, and led them to the belief that within this 'visible diurnal round' perfection was attainable. Hence invention was stimulated—the canvas glowed, and the marble breathed—the gods in ideal forms dwelt with men: and whether they lined the walls, or dignified the temples, they continually presented to the inhabitants of Athens, beauty of shape and a matchless excellence of execution.

But all this was of the earth. It never rose into a purer atmosphere. The soul, deprived of its proper aliment, hungered after unnatural sustenance, and a mythology, sprightly, elegant, varied, and graceful, exhibiting the power, if not the tenderness of human passion, sprung into existence. But even this was bound and fettered by an irresistible Fate, mightier than the Gods themselves, which, lying at the foundation of their religious creed, tended to weaken that sentiment of perfect freedom which forms the basis of genuine nationality. Indeed, the 'whole history of the Greeks manifests a selfishness which in so refined a people seems extraordinary. The home feelings, the genuine source of every pure affection and patriotic aspiration, were unknown to them, and the most sacred connexion was regarded merely as a matter of expediency—a means of supplying the state with citizens. This proved fatal to the purity and pathos of their amatory poetry, which the genius of Anacreon, and the passion of Sappho, could not raise above the pleasures of the debauch, or the sensuality of the harem.

Though the circumstances in which the Romans were placed were different, the effect was even more fatal to the development of a national literature. When their greatest writers appeared, Rome had become almost universal in her dominion. Her empire, with an iron sway, extended from east to west, and from north to south, over the whole of the known world. The metropolis was regarded as the common receptacle of the basest of mankind. Every vestige of liberty was nearly obliterated. Patriotism had expired, and hence the only traces of nationality that appear in their grandest works of imagination are as faint and indistinct as the distant limits of their vast empire.

On turning to the productions of the 'moderns, the aspect is entirely changed. Here we perceive a national spirit intensely

developed. We observe works of art fulfilling the whole conditions of humanity. The breaking up of the Roman empire, though it aided this feeling, did not give birth to it. The purifying influences of religion operating upon the most generous principles of human nature, were the cause of this change. This is evinced in a remarkable manner in the greatest efforts of modern genius. It imbues the writings of nearly all the early poets. This spirit of nationality is the peculiar characteristic of what has been termed the romantic school, and we feel gratified in thinking that in the literature of no nation is it more strikingly manifested than in that of England. From Chaucer to Burns, through the works of our most illustrious writers, it flows like a living stream, rendering the imaginative products of our own country the richest and the most varied of modern times.

If Chaucer was not the first writer of poetry in our vernacular tongue, he was, at least, the first great poet. He was the expressive index of the collected intelligence of his age. Courtier, statesman, scholar, he appears as the prototype of Milton, and excels as much in that branch of his art which he cultivated, as the sublime author of 'Paradise Lost' does, in his more lofty and transcendent flights. The great merit of Chaucer consists in his infantine, his Homeric simplicity, and his truly dramatic delineations. He is perhaps the most picturesque poet we possess. His paintings are fresh, glittering, and off-hand, done to the life. Not with elaborate strokes of art, but with a few bold and happy touches, the full character stands before us distinct, speaking, unmistakeable. The sphere in which he moves is not ample, but within 'that narrow round' how much has he effected! He has left us a picture gallery, which for truth, nature, and real excellence, is without a parallel in the whole range of modern literature. His love of nature resembles 'an intoxication of spirit.' His morning sketches are bright with perpetual sunshine; his flowers are always in bloom, fragrant with odoriferous perfumes, and gemmed with sparkling dewdrops. He revels in an everlasting spring, which is cheered with the singing of 'small birds,' and rendered delightful by sights and sounds, the impressive indications of rural happiness.

From Chaucer, through a period of sterility, we come to Spenser, the most luxuriant of all the sweet singers we can claim. In this poet the chivalrous spirit has found its noblest expositor. He may justly be styled the prince of allegorical painting. He is especially the favourite of the truly poetical. No others can relish him. For common minds he is too ethereal. Those who come to the study of his works must approach this great master imbued with a sense of beauty, otherwise they will

not feel the power of his sweet and solemn harmony. They must divest themselves of 'tangibilities,' for a season throw aside the realities of life, to wander through the dim forest with 'Una and her milkwhite lamb,' repose under the shadow of 'immemorial trees,' and be lulled into balmy slumber by the sound of falling waters. From the exuberance of his fancy and the wealth of his language, he has been the source whence numerous inferior writers have supplied themselves both with imagery and expression.

The stanza which he adopted and to which he has given his name, is in exquisite keeping with the nature of his subject. Its oft-recurring music, and its long and rounded close, fall upon the ear like the distant pealing of an organ, or the soft-swellling notes of an *Æolian* harp.

But it was not till a great cycle of advancement was terminated, and the destined period fulfilled—till the human mind was freed from priestly thralldom—till philosophy found a truthful expositor—till a new world was discovered—till commerce was extended—till England was placed at the head of the European confederacy, and the collected treasures of antiquity were laid open, that a genius arose, who at once appropriated the rich inheritance, and, with the power of an enchanter, reared from the accumulated mass a structure so dazzling as to strike with wonder and delight every succeeding generation.

We need hardly add that this magician was the immortal Shakspeare, the sublime exponent of the 'spirit of his age.' From the tenour of this article our readers will not be surprised that we differ, *toto cælo*, from those who assert that Shakspeare was as much indebted to his ignorance of classical antiquity, as to his genius, for his success as a dramatic poet. On the contrary, we believe him to have been skilled in all the true learning of his age. He was, we grant, no scholar, in the common acceptation of the term. He could not boast of the technical skill of a professor of languages, nor could he analyze a sentence with the ingenuity of an expert pedagogue. But he possessed that higher knowledge which comprehends the whole scope and nature of a subject, which hardly looks at the intermediate steps, but by a kind of intuitive perception arrives at a conclusion both correct and comprehensive. In a word, we contend that Shakspeare was a hard worker, that he embraced every opportunity which his age presented to compensate the defects of a scanty education.

The singular position in which the poet was placed, appears to us to put the question beyond a doubt. His great contemporaries were all men of learning; so were his predecessors. If he had not possessed a knowledge as extensive, though perhaps not

so scholastic as theirs, his genius, universal as it was, would have exerted its powers to little purpose. In vain might the kingly eagle attempt to soar in an exhausted receiver. His power of wing might be equal to the loftiest flights, but without an atmosphere to bear him up, his strugglings would be ineffectual.

Who that peruses any one of his wonderful dramas can doubt that his acquirements embraced all the intelligence of his times. Whether we contemplate the ethereal beauty shown in the *Tempest*; the fairy creations exhibited in *Midsummer Night's Dream*; the golden luxury displayed in *Antony and Cleopatra*; the correct historical truth evinced in *Coriolanus*; the stoic virtue, and serene wisdom, and artful eloquence, manifested in *Julius Cæsar*; the pride, the passion, the madness developed in *Lear*; the depth of philosophy discovered in *Hamlet*; the all-absorbing love in *Romeo and Juliet*; the terrible jealousy and rancorous hate in *Othello*; the murderous ambition in *Macbeth*; and the masterly historical delineations in the ten dramas which refer to our own country, can we hesitate to pronounce that the theory is absurd which would attribute these wonderful productions not to the intelligence but to the ignorance of their author?

The contemporaries of the immortal bard, as we have already hinted, were men whose minds were enriched with the entire knowledge of their age. They were scholars 'rare and ripe;' 'men of academic breeding,' who drank deep at the ancient fountains, yet preserved their separate individualities intact. They were not free from the influence of their times, nor did they desire to be so. They, however, truthfully caught its spirit, and stamped it upon their immortal writings. Conscious of their strength, they relied upon their native resources; and if they borrowed aught from antiquity, they reproduced it in a new shape, and made it entirely their own. They were fancy-free. They seldom deigned to follow models; and if at any time they so far condescended, it was with a freedom so graceful as to look like originality. The influences of their age were favourable to the development of their genius, and they all may be regarded as the culminating luminaries of a period of unusual splendour.

In the age which succeeded, there was a pause in mental progress. Poetry declined. This may be fairly attributed to the political troubles which harassed the nation. Yet during this period the muse was not silent. A tribe of writers who mistook their calling, assumed the title of poets, and turned the musical language of Spenser and Shakspeare into an unmeaning jingle, while they substituted metaphysical conceits for the creations of fancy. The men who might have succeeded the

Elizabethan bards, and have been successful followers in their brilliant track, had matters more solemn and weightier to deal with.

Destined to be the representatives of universal freedom through every succeeding age, they found but little leisure to dally with the muses. Yet they were embued with a fervour and a devotion which partook in a high degree of the poetical character. If the theatre was shut, the place of religious assemblies was open; if the brilliant creations of Shakspeare and the elder dramatists were viewed with devout horror, the songs of Zion and the sublime strains of prophet-bards resounded night and day both in the council and the field.

If some have denounced them as enthusiasts, their enthusiasm was expended in a holy cause. The ardour with which they undertook their mission, and the faithfulness with which they accomplished it, supply the best answer to their calumniators. They were, at once, the loftiest and the lowliest of men. Their devout and reverential study of the Scriptures gave an oriental sublimity to their expressions; and what in others might be thought affectation, in them was only natural. The brightest genius of modern times has done his best to bring them into contempt. But, like giants as they were, they tower above all the malignity that has assailed them. Though their merits are every day being better appreciated, they have not yet received their full reward. Future generations will testify to their worth, and pronounce upon their virtues. Truly their lives were a great epic.

In 1660, the Commonwealth was at an end. Along with the restoration came a tribe of writers who slavishly subjected their thoughts and style to foreign models; who squared their genius with the rules of etiquette, and deemed all writing profane that did not wear a court dress; who, like unnatural parents, were ashamed of their own offspring, and would not dare to repeat the language of Shakspeare, since the sovereign or his paramours had pronounced it vulgar.

Amidst a crew so despicable, there still remained one spirit who stood true to nature and to virtue—a mighty relic of departed greatness, a remnant of that gigantic race who had perished in the revolutionary flood. This master-spirit towered erect above the general ruin.

Poor, old, blind, persecuted, Milton, with an intellect as capacious as it was cultivated—with a mind enriched with all the learning of a learned age, possessing, unimpaired thereby, an imagination perhaps the most sublime ever bestowed upon man, appeared, to redeem his country, if not from the despotism by

which its liberties were crushed, at least to free it from subjection to that foreign influence, which was at variance, not only with true taste, but with nature itself.

A philosopher, a politician, a theologian, a Christian, a patriot, in a word, the greatest scholar of his own times, Milton affords us the best example of those principles which we have been endeavouring to illustrate—viz., *That the highest mental culture, and the severest intellectual discipline, are not unpropitious to the grandest efforts of imagination.*

Why dwell on the wonders of the 'Paradise Lost?' Why trace the flight of this daring genius through the regions of death, and chaos, and the elder night? Why pursue his sublime track through that terrible abyss whose soil was 'burning marle,' whose roof was one vast concave of hottest flame, and whose oceans were floods of tossing fire? Why gaze with astonishment on the labours of the infernal hosts, or listen to the sound of angelic harmony, of 'harp, and lute, and dulcimer,' and behold, rising from the flaming deep, 'like a gorgeous exhalation,' the palace of Hell's potentate, the star-gemmed Pandemonium? Why, crushed under the weight of so much misery and splendour, bathe our wearied spirits in Elysium, and wander with heavenly guests through the fragrant groves and amaranthine bowers of Paradise, listening to 'the song of earliest birds,' and the sound of lulling waters, quaffing immortal draughts from cool and sacred fountains, or reposing with the most innocent and the loveliest pair that earth has ever borne upon its bosom, beneath the embowering branches of the tree of life? Why, satiated with 'this verdurous beauty,' this green repose, re-ascend with the adventurous bard and view 'the celestial hierarchies' armed in panoply of adamant and gold, and behold, engaged in angelic sport, the 'youth of heaven!' Why call up these visions, seeing that all this, and more than this, has been so often reiterated as to have become the very cant of criticism? Yet no less eloquently than truthfully has it been said, that 'To Milton, and to Milton alone, belonged the secrets of the great deep, the beach of sulphur, the ocean of fire, the palaces of the fallen dominions glimmering through the everlasting shade, the silent wilderness of shadow, and verdure, and fragrance, where armed angels kept watch over the sleep of the first lovers, the portico of diamond, the sea of jasper, the sapphire pavement empurpled with celestial roses, and the infinite ranks of cherubim and seraphim blazing with adamant and gold.'

From the contemplation of the works of this great poet we rise with hope, we gather strength and confidence as we advance, and we feel assurance in the truth of our assertion, that the most

perfect mental discipline is not inimical to the muses, that civilization is not the antagonist of poetry, and that the imaginative faculties attain their highest development, and reach their greatest excellence, when under the guidance of the most matured judgment.

With the reign of the second Charles there seemed to occur a pause in the progress of intelligence. A deep gloom overspread not only the political, but the intellectual atmosphere; if genius exerted her powers, it was only fitfully, and her efforts were dedicated to vice, rather than consecrated to virtue. The only poet that can be mentioned after Milton, who, perhaps, might have been his rival, had he flourished in a more propitious era, is Dryden. The necessities of his circumstances, the cry for daily bread, compelled him to imitate the false taste which was then in vogue; but though he followed the vicious models which fashion had set up, it was evidently with constraint; his strong natural genius could not always be coerced, and as often as he forgot the pressure of poverty and followed his own promptings, he rose to the dignity of an original writer. Though Dryden possessed strength, he was deficient in tenderness. He was but little acquainted with the secret workings of the human heart: he viewed man as the creature of society—his vision could not penetrate beneath the surface; the silent depths, the terrible abysses of the individual spirit were to him unfathomable. Hence, as a dramatist, he was totally unsuccessful. As a satirist, he made a nearer approach to the power and energy of Juvenal than any modern writer; and as a translator he has scarcely an equal. During the troublous times which succeeded, no poet of eminence appeared till the reign of Anne; then the effects of the preceding reigns began to manifest themselves in polite, though feeble imitations of the ancients. If we except Pope and Thompson, there are no names of renown to illustrate this period. The writings of the former may justly be regarded as the perfection of the artificial school. Terse, clear, elegant, Pope raised the language of his country to the very extreme of refinement. To affirm, as some writers of modern fame have done, that Pope was no poet, is to betray both ignorance and prejudice: though devoid of high powers of imagination, such as those of Shakespeare or Milton, he was gifted with the most brilliant fancy, and the keenest wit. To prove this, we need only mention his ‘Rape of the Lock,’ which is, without doubt, the most exquisite production of its kind in any language. Thompson was a writer of truly original genius; though his ‘Seasons’ are modelled after the Georgics of Virgil, they rise, in their treatment, far above imitation. If a pomposity of diction sometimes obscures and

weakens his finest thoughts, yet his love of nature, the picturesqueness of his delineations, the truthfulness of his descriptions, the feeling of ease and earnestness, and the delight with which the poet luxuriates in his subject, captivate every reader, and please all who can admire the beautiful in external nature. On account of these excellences, 'The Seasons' have become a household book.

If, during the reign of George III., the principles of civil liberty were advancing, the poetry of the early part of that reign had reached the lowest point of feebleness. The nerve, vigour, originality, and raciness of the elder writers were supplanted by elegant versification, flimsy sentimentality, a meaningless parade of language, and a servile imitation of foreign models. The vital, or at least, the natural spirit of our poetry had disappeared, and all hopes of resuscitation seemed extinct. But a change was at hand. Two poets appeared to re-invigorate the whole body of our imaginative literature—we mean Cowper and Burns. Did our limits admit, we would willingly dilate on the peculiar excellencies of these writers, whose works we regard as having given birth to those quickening influences which have since elevated our poetical literature to the rank of originality.

The truth, nature, and feeling evinced by Burns, in his lyrical pieces, are unrivalled. No poet, either in ancient or modern times, can, in this case, be compared with him. Passionate as Sappho, he is far less sensuous; airy and graceful as Anacreon, he has a pathos which that elegant crotic enthusiast never exhibits; sublime as Horace, his patriotism is purer, and his sentiments more exalting. In a word, Burns is the prince of song writers. Like every original genius, he gave the tone to the literature of his age, and became the founder of a school, which can number among its followers names that posterity will not willingly let die.

If the subjects of Cowper's muse were different from those of Burns, he was nevertheless equally original. Themes which, in his day, were regarded with contempt, did not deter this right-hearted Christian poet from making them an object worthy of his genius. He showed that religious poetry, in the hands of a writer of eminence, might become a thing of light and excellence, that the common-places with which it had been obscured and degraded by meaner bards, might be avoided, and that force, fervour, and originality might be evinced by the true poet, on whatever subject he might exert his genius.

The great merit of Cowper is that he discards conventionalisms. He detests ceremony. Plainness and simplicity he follows almost to rustic coarseness. The elegancies of language which Pope

introduced, and which, through means of his servile imitators, had degenerated into effeminacy, Cowper scorns, and, to show his contempt, pushes the opposite system perhaps too far, by using a vigorous, manly, though sometimes a rugged diction. 'The Task' was the harbinger of a healthful change, of a coming renovation; and the political events of the times were favourable to its development. The American war of independence, and its successful termination—the increasing desire of liberty in Europe—the commencement of the French revolution—the improvements in machinery, which placed England at the head of European nations—the brilliant discoveries in science—the exploratory voyages which laid open new lands, and fruitful islands—the revival of a spirit of religion which, in its home enterprises and missionary activity, resembled the zeal of primitive times—all this acted with accumulated force upon the general mind, and sent its vivifying influences to the very heart of the nation, while it lighted up with a true nationality the literature of the age. Poets who, if they did not equal, strove to imitate the manner and catch the spirit of the great writers of the Elizabethan age—Southey, Coleridge, Campbell, Scott, each possessing peculiar excellences, redeemed the errors of the half-century which preceded them, and charmed and instructed all who perused their writings. They proved likewise that though the age had become intellectual, it was not unimaginative; and if they did not manifest the brilliancy of invention which characterizes a Shakspeare or a Calderon, they gave signs of a return towards 'fresh fields and pastures new,' and evinced a determination to return to the 'ancient wells of English undefiled.'

If, as some have asserted, the most excellent poetry be that which produces the greatest effect upon its readers, no productions of our times can stand in competition with those of Byron. If his egotism is too conspicuous throughout all his writings—if he can never separate himself from his subject, or create a hero, but in his own likeness—still it must be confessed that he expands, and magnifies, and brightens, whatever he touches. His misanthropy, which in others would dwarf itself into effeminate weakness, with him rises into gigantic vastness, and is rendered not only tolerable but attractive, by its earnestness and passion. On this account it is especially pernicious. When Byron prostituted the sacred dignity of poetry to the purposes of vice, he threw around his pictures such a profusion of dazzling lights and gorgeous hues, as to render them, like fallen spirits, 'the excess of glory obscured.' Morning, with its dews and fragrance, and sunlight and song; mid-day, with its splendours; evening, with its

soft lights, its purple hues, its golden clouds; and night, 'clad in the beauty of a thousand stars;'—the sky, the earth, the ocean,—all nature, became obedient to his power, and ministered to the delirium of his song. Force, energy, compression, perspicuity, are the characteristics of his style. In this respect we have no hesitation in placing Byron in the first rank among those who follow Homer and Dante, Shakspeare and Milton.

Contemporary with this great poet was one who, following no model but the restless movements of an unbridled will, marred the powers of his dazzling genius in striving after a perfection which, upon his own scheme, was utterly unattainable. The imaginative powers of Shelley were of a higher order than those of Byron, but, from an improper choice of subjects on which to exert them, they were less effective. By breaking away, like the mad coursers of the sun, from the beaten track, the common highway of literature, as he unwisely deemed it, he ran contrary to the principles of his art; since poetry, to engage sympathy, must, however elevated, be still akin to humanity. Nor does this, by any means, exclude originality. The 'idea,' when developed in the soul of the great poet, whether in a Homer, a Virgil, a Tasso, or a Milton, is still the same. In each it is the creative faculty; in each it exerts a vigorous vitality, and, like a healthful tree, in whatever soil it may be planted, under whatever skies it may flourish, it adapts the materials which surround it to its growth and expansion.

Shelley did not believe this. He panted after a higher originality, and he failed. His writings excite astonishment, but they leave no abiding impressions, and they are less adapted to instruct, than to dazzle and bewilder. Yet who that peruses the ethereal products of his muse can do otherwise than wonder at the gorgeous drapery with which he has adorned them. His thoughts, his language, his imagery, seem to belong to some far off sphere, some fairy realm where the air is all balm, the clouds fleecy gold, the moon a bark of pearl; where rose-tinted oceans dash their soft-flashing billows against shores diamond-paved, where fountains swell, and waters flow under the shadow of endless groves, and in trembling lustre reflect the emerald light. Strange ærial beings people these abodes, and vanish in the dim glades, leaving behind them only the startling impression that powers of the first order have been wasted in the creation of meteors as delusive as they are dazzling.

Here we might enumerate a list of names that have illustrated the age in which they live by their poetical talents, but our limits forbid. The sparkling fancy of Moore, the keen, searching, anatomical characterization of Crabbe, the gracefulness and

purity of Montgomery, the classic elegance and simple pathos of Rogers, the calm, contemplative, and serene philosophy of Wordsworth, offer proofs enough of what we contend for—*That an age of intellect is not inimical to the efforts of genius.* It should seem, however, that at present there is but little to favour this opinion. A pause, it is true, has occurred, but we feel confident of a reaction, vital, vigorous, and lasting. The demand for works such as those placed at the head of this article, shows the healthful spirit of the times—a return to the school of nature—a step towards the unadulterated fountains of our elder poetry.

The public has long since pronounced its verdict on the writings of Leigh Hunt. His fine and graceful fancy, his admiration of nature in its simplest forms, his racy quaintness of expression, his interminable flow of excellent spirits, which never know interruption or depression, his strong faith in humanity, lapsed as it is from its primeval purity, and above all, his genuine picturesqueness, which imparts to his diction the glow and vividness of painting, demonstrate that he possesses the true spirit of a poet, and that he is one of the most successful followers of our elder bards. It is, however, questionable whether his writings contain that which will secure to them a permanent power. Simplicity is his great aim, but this is often spoilt through an intolerable mannerism which borders on affectation. He toils after an individuality which, because it is imitative, is not natural. His originality consists more in vigour and aptitude of expression than newness of thought. The circle in which he moves is a narrow one. He sings as a linnet, but seldom soars like an eagle. His flights never extend 'beyond this visible diurnal sphere.' His picture of 'naiads,' however fresh and glittering, bears the stamp of earth upon it. His goddesses are rotund, apple-cheeked, and rosy, palpable to sense, less ethereal than the fine creations of Shakspeare, or the shadowy abstractions of Shelley. His morality is pure, but it seems founded more on the feelings, which are in their nature variable, than on the dictates of conscience, which are fixed and unchangeable. He is, in short, a pleasant companion; rather than a stern teacher—a mild and gentle enthusiast, rather than a sublime and powerful poet. We can only find space for two exquisite pictures. They will illustrate our remarks:—

LEANDER HOPEFUL.

'Smooth was the sea that night, the lover strong,
And in the *springy waves* he danced along;
He rose, he dipp'd his breast, he aim'd, he cut
With his clear arms, and from before him put
The parting waves, and in and out the air
His shoulders felt, and trail'd his washing hair;

- But when he saw the torch, oh! how he sprung,
*And thrust his feet against the waves, and flung
 The foam behind, as though he scorned the sea,
 And parted his wet locks, and breathed with glee,
 And rose and panted most triumphantly.*

LEANDER IN DISTRESS.

‘ Meantime the sun had sunk, the hilly mark
 Across the straits, mixed with the mightier dark,
 And night came on. All noises by degrees
 Were hushed—the fisher’s call, the birds, the trees,
All but the washing of the eternal seas!
 But he, Leander, almost half across,
Threw his blithe locks behind him, with a toss,
 And hailed the light victoriously, secure
 Of clasping his kind love, so sweet and sure;
 When suddenly a blast, as if in wrath,
 Sheer from the hills came headlong on his path;
 Then started off; and driving round the sea,
 Dashed up the panting waters roaringly :
 The youth at once was thrust beneath the main
With blinded eyes, but quickly rose again,
 And with a smile at heart, and stouter pride,
 Surmounted like a god the *roaring tide.*
 But what? The torch gone out! So long too! see!
 He thinks it comes! Ah yes—’tis she—’tis she!’

Keats, who died young, was a writer of the richest promise. Riper years and a maturer judgment would have effected much with a fancy so exuberant, and a mind so thoroughly filled with a love of the beautiful. Since the ‘Masque’ of Ben Jonson, and the ‘Faithful Shepherdess’ of Beaumont and Fletcher, nothing has appeared equal in ‘wondrous luxuriance’ to his ‘Endymion.’ Here the poet revels at will amidst verdant lawns, silent shades, embowering groves, far-stretching forests, and flowery slopes; over which satyrs and fawns, and troops of sylvan deities, are seen tripping, till they disappear among the brown woods, or beyond the shadowy mountains. His muse seems overlaid, or rather smothered under a load of ‘rich-coming fancies.’ Rose-leaves, musk-blooms, and the arabesque drapery of overhanging and intertwining boughs, through which the sunshine showers its tremulous drops of silvery light, are the staple of her song. She feeds on ambrosia, and quenches her thirst at the head of old and fabulous wells, which nymphs inhabit, and whose cool and transparent waters they curl and dimple with their soft and silent breathings. This wealth of fancy is poured out in such profusion as to defy arrangement. The senses of the reader are

bewildered. He strives in vain to thread his way out of this interminable maze. His efforts are useless, and in a sort of hopeless languishment, he gives himself up to the guidance of the poet, till being led to—

‘Fountains grotesque, new trees, bespangled caves,
Echoing grottoes, full of tumbling waves,
And moonlight,’——

he falls asleep and dreams, till life's sorrows break his slumbers and call him again to battle with the world's realities. Yet in his later poems, there is a manifest improvement. His sonnets are beautiful and picturesque, and strictly in accordance with the laws that regulate this branch of the poetic art. His ‘Ode to the Nightingale’ is exquisite. One feels almost intoxicated with a sense of harmony, in the perusal of its mellifluous numbers. Take the following specimen, all we can afford to present:—

ODE TO A NIGHTINGALE.

‘My heart aches, and a drowsy numbness pains
My sense, as though of hemlock I had drunk,
Or emptied some dull opiate to the drains,
One minute past, and Lethe-ward had sunk;
’Tis not through envy of thy happy lot,
But being too happy in thy happiness,
That thou, light-winged Dryad of the trees,
In some melodious plot
Of beechen green, and shadows numberless,
Singest of summer in full-throated ease.
Oh for a draught of vintage that hath been
Cool’d a long age in the deep-delved earth;
Tasting of Flora and the country green,
Dance and Provençal song, and sun-burnt mirth!
Oh for a beaker full of the warm south,
Full of the true, the blushful Hippocrene,
With beaded bubbles working at the brim,
And purple-stained mouth,
That I might drink, and leave the world unseen,
And fade with thee away into the forest dim!’

The followers of Keats have been few, but from his school a new order of writers has risen, of whom Alfred Tennyson may be regarded as the head. On the merits and defects of this school we cannot at present enlarge. This much, however, we may say, that their excellences, which are many, are obscured by a quaintness, an affectation, and a mannerism which exhibit

a poverty of thought that far-fetched imagery and grotesque phraseology cannot compensate.

Of the songs and poems of Barry Cornwall, we can only repeat, that, though far inferior to the lyrics of Burns in tenderness and pathos and natural feeling, they more nearly approach the effusions of our older dramatists than any others which have fallen under our notice. It is a hopeful movement when we perceive such works as those we have mentioned likely to become popular. The publishers, we think, have calculated rightly on the spirit of the age, and we trust that the cheap form in which they have given them to the public will return them an ample remuneration. ❦

Our writers of established reputation, having either been numbered with the dead, or having secured their immortality, lay reposing on their laurels in 'mute,' though not 'inglorious silence,' when we were taken by surprise with the announcement made by some of our contemporaries, that a writer had appeared who was to rival 'the bardic glories' of our noblest poets. Our disappointment may well be conceived when, upon opening the volume which had caused such a commotion among the small critics of the day, we could perceive nothing to justify this sound of trumpets. We came to the perusal of the poem with high expectations—every feeling was favourably disposed towards its author. We saw by anticipation, before we read a single page, the realization of our own theory, and we beheld it as the approach of dawn amidst the silence and solitude of the desert. Judge then our mortification when we were obliged to lay aside the book as one possessing few claims to originality, either in imagery or narrative.

The tale entitled 'A Romance of London,' is a wretched piece of improbability; in constructiveness inferior to the third-rate class of novels—the spawn of the Minerva press. The language is strained, pompous, redundant, and frequently unmeaning; the imagery is either incorrect or common-place; and the thoughts meagre in the extreme. The title is a misnomer. 'The New Tâmon' bears no manner of resemblance to the old. It can offer no claims to relationship. The one, though centuries have rolled over its head, is still green in youth, fresh, vigorous, and exulting in its immortal beauty; the other already bears the marks of speedy decay—its decrepitude is visible. Let us attempt a brief analysis of the story:—

It is 'luxuriant May;' dawn has succeeded night; the gamester has stolen 'pale-eyed' from the hell in which he has forsworn his honour and his virtue; the 'jaded beauty' has left the ball; and other meaner incidents have occurred, hardly equal to the dignity

of poetry. At this suspicious hour a stranger passes along. He observes on a door-step a young woman of surpassing beauty, but apparently in poverty. He accosts her, and invites her to his home; and, to induce her to enter his 'hospitable doors,' he very properly intimates that there is neither danger nor indelicacy in consenting. 'We have a sister here!' This benevolent stranger is a half-cast. He has the taint of an Indian origin in his blood. His father, a 'Sankara Varna,' was cursed with an English wife. The fruit of this marriage was this same half-savage, half-philanthropist. The father fell in battle; he was soon forgotten by his affectionate widow, who again married and had a daughter.

The unnatural mother detests her own son, and poisons the springs of affection in her daughter's mind respecting him. An old nabob, his father's friend, makes a will—dies, and leaves this native of the jungle a princely fortune. He arrives in England. His mother dies, and, when too late, repents of her cruelty. Death-bed repentances are dangerous. She places her daughter, Calantha, under his protection. Cut by 'genteel society,' our hero becomes a 'misanthrope,' hence his cognomen 'The New Timon,' though he does not retire to the woods, feed upon roots, and curse humanity. He renews his acquaintance with an old debauchee—a worn out roué, now happily reformed, called Lord Arden. The story of this lord, which is introduced by way of episode or by-plot, is so lame and improbable, that we must, out of perfect weariness, pass it over. It contains a counterfeit marriage, and a concealment which mark the utter selfishness of the principal character. Its morality too, is very questionable. The friendless Lucy is discovered to be the daughter of Arden, but in the meantime 'The New Timon' is captivated with her beauty. At this period 'Timon' discovers that Calantha has been wronged by Arden, and on this account the intended match with his daughter is broken off, and Lucy is restored to her father. Timon, or Morvale, in a fit of despair takes to his old habits, and ranges the country 'far and wide.' Calantha dies, and Arden, soon after, pays the debt of nature, leaving his daughter illegitimate and penniless. But the obstacle to the wishes of the lovers being now removed, by a fortunate casualty, they meet by the grave of Arden—there repeat their vows, and, we take it for granted, are at last united. And this meagre story has been puffed into notice, and pronounced both in construction and execution one of the first poems of the age.

To confirm our remarks, it will be but just to our readers to adduce a few specimens of this anonymous writer's '*New Timon*,'

from which they will be able to form their own opinion of his merits, and judge of the correctness of *our* strictures.

LONDON AT DAY-BREAK.

' O'er royal London, in luxuriant May,
While lamps yet twinkled, dawning crept the day.
Home from the hell the pale-eyed gamester steals;
Home from the ball flash jaded Beauty's wheels;
The lean grimalkin, who, since night began,
Hath hymn'd to love amidst the wrath of man,
Scared from his raptures by the morning star,
Flits finely by, and threads the area bar;
From fields suburban rolls the early cart;
As rests the revel, so awakes the mart.
Transfusing Mocha from the beans within,
Bright by the crossing gleams the alchemic tin,—
There halts the craftsman;—there, with envious sigh,
The houseless vagrant looks, and limps foot-weary by.
Behold that street;—the Omphalos of Town!
Where the grim palace wears the prison's frown,
As mindful still, amidst a gaudier race,
Of the veil'd Genius of the mournful Place—
Of floors no majesty but Grief's had trod,
And weary limbs that only knelt to God!"

The opening lines are produced for effect, and they may be taken as a fair sample of the whole style of the poem.

The picture of the 'lean grimalkin' is neither happy nor delicate, and the six last lines we have quoted are so obscure that even the lustre of a foot note can scarcely brighten them. We pass by the auctioneer-like pomp of expression in which this author indulges, such as 'fields suburban' for 'neighbouring gardens;' 'alchemic tin,' for 'coffee pot;' 'Omphalos of Town,' which even the authority of George Robins, quoted by the writer, cannot excuse.

The following description is more free from fault. It reminds us of Crabbe, though it has neither the general strength nor graphic power of that great poet :

' Behold her by the couch, on bended knees!
There the wan mother—there the last disease!
Dread to the poor the least suspense of health,—
Their hands their friends,—their labour all their wealth:
Let the wheel rest from toil a single sun,
And all the humble clock-work is undone.
The custom lost, the drain upon the hoard,
The debt that sweeps the fragment from the board,
How mark the hunger round thee, and be brave—

Foresee thy orphan, and not fear the grave?
 Lower and ever lower in the grade
 Of penury fell the mother and the maid,
 Till the grim close; when, as the midnight rain
 Drove to the pallet through the broken pane,
 The dying murmured: 'Near,—thy hand,—more near!
 I am not what scorn deem'd,—yet not severe
 The doom which leaves me in the hour of death
 The right to bless thee with my parting breath—
 These, worn till now, wear thou, his daughter. Live
 To see thy Sire, and tell him—I forgive!'—
 Cold the child thrills beneath the hands that press
 Her bended neck—slow slackens the caress—
 Loud the roof rattles with the stormy gust;—
 The grief is silent, and the love is dust;—
 From the spent fuel God's bright spark is flown;
 And there the Motherless, and Death—alone!

We should be wanting in candour if we omitted the following sketches. We think them masterly, almost sufficient of themselves to redeem the work from that oblivion to which we fear it is inevitably destined. If we did not deem it invidious to select from so admirable a group, we should give the preference to the portraits of Wellington and O'Connell, though that of Lord Stanley is almost equally finished and elaborate.

'And o'er the altered scene Calantha's eye
 Roves listless—yet Time's Great the passers by!
 Along the road still fleet the men, whose names
 Live in the talk the Moment's glory claims.
 There, for that storm or stagnor, 'The Debate,'
 Pass to their post the helmsmen of the state.
 Now, 'on his humble but his faithful steed,'
 Sir Robert rides—he never rides at speed—
 Careful his seat, and circumspect his gaze;
 And still the cautious trot the cautious mind betrays.
 Wise is thy heed!—how stout soe'er his back,
 Thy weight has oft proved fatal to thy hack!

'Next, with loose rein and careless canter view
 Our man of men, the Prince of Waterloo;
 O'er the firm brow the hat as firmly prest,
 The firm shape rigid in the button'd vest;
 Within—the iron which the fire has proved,
 And the close Sparta of a mind unmoved!
 Not his the wealth to some large natures lent,
 Divinely lavish, even where misspent,
 That liberal sunshine of exuberant soul,
 Thought, sense, affection, warming up the whole;

The heat and affluence of a genial power,
 Rank in the weed as vivid in the flower;
 Hush'd at command his veriest passions halt,
 Drill'd is each virtue, disciplined each fault;
 Warm if his blood—he reasons while he glows,
 Admits the pleasure—ne'er the folly knows;
 If for our Mars his snare had Vulcan set,
 Hé had won the Venus, but escaped the net;
 His eye ne'er wrong, if circumscribed the sight,
 Widen the prospect and it ne'er is right,
 Seen through the telescope of habit still,
 States seem a camp, and all the world—a drill!

' Yet oh, how few his faults, how pure his mind,
 Beside his fellow-conquerors of mankind;
 How knightly seems the iron image, shown
 By Marlborough's tomb, or lost Napoleon's throne!
 Cold if his lips, no smile of fraud they wear,
 Stern if his heart, still 'Man' is graven there;
 No guile—no crime his step to greatness made,
 No freedom trampled, and no trust betray'd;
 The eternal 'I' was not his law—he rose
 Without one art that honour might oppose,
 And leaves a human, if a hero's, name,
 To curb ambition while it lights to fame.

' But who, scarce less by every gazer eyed,
 Walks yonder, swinging with a stalwart stride?
 With that vast bulk of chest and limb assign'd
 So oft to men who subjugate their kind;
 So sturdy Cromwell push'd broad shoulder'd on;
 So burly Luther breasted Babylon;
 So brawny Cleon bawl'd his Agora down;
 And large-limb'd Mahmud clutch'd a Prophet's crown!

' Ay, mark him well! the schemer's subtle eye,
 The stage-mime's plastic lip your search defy—
 He, like Lysander, never deems it sin
 To eke the lion's with the fox's skin;
 Vain every mesh this Proteus to enthrall,
 He breaks no statute, and he creeps through all;—
 First to the mass that valiant truth to tell,
 'Rebellion's art is never to rebel,—
 Elude all danger but defy all laws,'—
 He stands himself the Safe Sublime he draws!
 In him behold all contrasts which belong
 To minds abased, but passions rous'd, by wrong;
 The blood all fervour, and the brain all guile,—
 The patriot's bluntness, and the bondsman's wile.

' One after one the lords of time advance,—
 Here Stanley meets,—how Stanley scorns, the glance!

The brilliant chief, irregularly great,
 Frank, haughty, rash,—the Rupert of Debate!
 Nor gout, nor toil, his freshness can destroy,
 And Time still leaves all Eton in the boy;—
 First in the class, and keenest in the ring,
 He saps like Gladstone, and he fights like Spring!
 Ev'n at the feast, his pluck pervades the board,
 And dauntless game-cocks symbolize their lord.
 Lo where a tilt at friend—if barr'd from foe—
 He scours the ground, and volunteers the blow,
 And, tired with conquest over Dan and Snob,
 Plants a sly bruiser on the nose of Bob;
 Decorous Bob, too friendly to reprove,
 Suggests fresh fighting in the next remove,
 And prompts his chum, in hopes the vein to cool,
 To the prim benches of the Upper School:

' Yet who not listens, with delighted smile,
 To the pure Saxon of that silver style;
 In the clear style a heart as clear is seen,
 Prompt to the rash—revolting from the mean.

' Next cool, and all unconscious of reproach,
 Comes the calm 'Johnny who upset the coach.'
 How formed to lead, if not too proud to please,—
 His fame would fire you, but his manners freeze.
 Like or dislike, he does not care a jot;
 He wants your vote, but your affection not;
 Yet human hearts need sun, as well as oats,—
 So cold a climate plays the deuce with votes.—
 And while his doctrines ripen day by day,
 His frost-nipp'd party pines itself away;—
 From the starved wretch its own loved child we steal—
 And 'Free Trade' chirrup on the lap of Peel!—
 But see our statesman when the steam is on,
 And languid Johnny glows to glorious John!
 When Hampden's thought, by Falkland's muses drest,
 Lights the pale cheek, and swells the generous breast;
 When the pent heat expands the quickening soul,—
 And foremost in the race the wheels of genius roll!

But we have indulged in quotation beyond our limits. To the book itself we therefore refer our readers, taking for granted that they will have patience to wade through its interminable common-places.

Shall we, then, rise from the perusal of this poem with the conviction that the age of originality is past—that the freshness of the world's prime is gone for ever—that the immortal youth of the daughters of Jove is a fable—that the expansion of the human

intellect and the progress of reason have deprived imagination of its powers, and reduced the splendour of its diction and the loftiness of its flights to the humblest creeping, and the most intolerable prose? The proofs of an opposite kind we have adduced repel the idea.

We flatter ourselves that we have made good our case by examples amounting to moral demonstration, and we leave the subject with the impression that it cannot be refuted. We feel convinced that, so long as the human heart exults with rapture, or droops with sorrow—palpitates with hope, or is overwhelmed with despair—melts with love, or rages with jealousy—glows with anger, or is maddened with revenge—is, in short, the subject of those innumerable feelings to which it can find utterance only in the language of the bard—so long will there be materials for poetry of the highest class.

But prospectively a more glorious era awaits us, when the picturings of prophet-bards shall be realized—when man's moral and intellectual nature shall be fully developed—and when the loving spirit of Christianity shall influence all hearts and elevate all minds. Then shall the imagination put forth its utmost capability, and poetry become the handmaid of virtue; while songs of triumph shall proclaim, that Earth is redeemed and Paradise restored!

ART. IV.—*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*. C. J. HEFELE. Ed. alt. Tübingæ. 1842.

IT is an ancient and familiar practice to honour the first promoters of any truth or art by the respectful title of Fathers, and there is a most innocent sense in which we may accord this honour to the first teachers of the Christian doctrines. Whatever error or practical evil there may be in ascribing to them an amount of knowledge which was beyond their reach, or a degree of authority to which they neither did nor could make any pretensions, we can have but an imperfect notion of the history of the Christian religion, without some knowledge of their character and of their writings. The church writers that come immediately after the apostles, are styled *Apostolical Fathers*—a somewhat ambiguous and illusive designation, inasmuch as it suggests the idea that they possessed a higher degree than those who have come after them, of the truth and the wisdom with which the apostles were endowed. In this view

we regret that we are under the necessity of adopting phraseology so apt to mislead; our only resource is to explain that this is not our meaning; that we speak of the apostolical fathers merely for the sake of conventional perspicuity; and that we hope to shew briefly yet clearly, that the veneration in which these fathers are professedly held, is founded either in historical error, in popular superstition, or in the craft of priests.

The apostolical fathers are Barnabas, Hermas, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the unknown writer of the epistle to Diognetus: of these the most prominent are Clemens, Ignatius, and Polycarp, to whom our present observations will be confined.

We must pass over the literary history and the critical disquisitions relating to these writers; such matters are interesting only to scholars, who will find rich stores of materials in Cotelierius, Cave, Jacobson, and Hefele: the last mentioned author, the title of whose book is given at the head of this article, is ordinary Professor of Catholic Theology in the University of Tübingen.

He has published some other valuable works, an edition and translation of the epistle of Barnabas, and a History of the Introduction of Christianity into South-West Germany, especially Württemberg. The first edition of the work now before us was intended to supply in theological literature the want of a cheap and convenient text-book for lecturers and for students. We are glad to see that in little more than three years that edition was exhausted, and that it has been followed by a second, in clearer type and on better paper, improved by greater accuracy in printing, and enriched with many various readings and notes, from the more expensive collections of Rothe, Thönnissen, Jacobson, Arndt, and other recent editors.

The Prolegomena are clear, full, and in the main, satisfactory; there is a good Index Rerum et Personarum, and the whole forms a respectable and cheap octavo volume of 269 pages.

Along with the reading of these ancient compositions, the student of Christian antiquities will do well to make a collation for himself of the few and scanty references to Christians and their affairs, in Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and Pliny. The compilations of Eusebius are of value, notwithstanding the credulity of the good bishop.

To the English reader we should wish to recommend Archbishop Wake's translation of the Apostolical Fathers; but it is in some respects unfair; his prefaces are feeble, confused, wanting in enlightened criticism, and rife in that class of com-

fortable prejudices from which few men of his order have the vigour or the honesty to free themselves. For these reasons we would suggest that the reader of the archbishop's translation should become familiar with some comparatively recent examinations of the Apostolical Fathers. The first of these, in the order of publication, is an exposure of the Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical Fathers, by W. Osborn, jun., a lay-member of the church of England, and we should judge, a man of evangelical principles. Entering on his work with the very natural feeling of tender reverence for these ancient worthies which has been so common in writers on divinity, he discovers, as he advances, the inconvenience of this prejudice, and he thinks that a faithful exposure of the errors actually taught by the early fathers may do good service to the Christian cause.

The Bampton Lecture for 1839, is an Analytical Examination into the character, value, and just application of the Writings of the Christian Fathers during the Ante-Nicene Period, by W. D. Coneybeare, M.A.

Mr. Coneybeare deservedly enjoys the esteem of the scientific as a patient geologist. His literary services in theology have been confined, we believe, to a course of Lectures at Bristol College, and these Bampton Lectures. In all that he has published, he gives proof of a healthy mind, philosophic habits, respectable scholarship, great industry, a gentle spirit, and a liberal, unaffected piety. With some strength and clearness he distinguishes the authority of the Bible from the 'Subsidiary aid' in the interpretation of the Bible, though, in our judgment he follows the greater part of the Anglican divines, in unduly estimating both the quality and the value of the subsidiary aid. As Mr. Coneybeare has not adopted the convenient modern usage of supplementary notes, we are tempted to ascribe to him a less degree of critical attention to the writers he has analysed than that which he has employed. We give an instance or two, in passing, of the disadvantage of too hasty a preparation for so laborious a work, or of confining the work within too narrow limits. The first of these, is the uncriticising spirit in which he assumes, as a fact that had never been doubted, that Clemens the writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians, is the Clemens to whom Saint Paul refers in the Epistle to the Philippians. Mr. Coneybeare cannot need to be reminded that the tendency of a later age was to invent as close a connexion as possible between the Fathers and the Apostles, for he has himself corrected an error of this kind in connexion with Hermas. Now what are the facts and the probabilities of the case? In Clemens' own epistle, he describes the Apostles as appointing some of their

converts in each place as the bishops and the deacons of their respective churches. Though Clemens does not style himself the bishop of Rome, nor indeed a bishop at all, it is evident from his name, from some of his allusions, and from the fact of his writing this epistle in the name of the church at Rome, that he was a Roman. The persons to whom Paul sends his salutations at Philippi, were, on the same principles, Philippians. No mention is made of Clemens accompanying Paul to Philippi, or of his being his companion, along with Silas, Timothy, and Luke, either in his journey to Philippi, or in any other journey; and it is remarkable that Irenæus, in a passage intended to give the highest view of the dignity of Clemens, speaks of Linus as mentioned by Paul, *while he does not speak thus of Clemens*; from which omission it is natural to infer that Irenæus was not of the opinion which has been founded on more recent conjectures.—Again, Mr. Coneybeare quietly takes for granted, in a note, that ‘there could not have been more than one bishop in the single city of Corinth;’ a slight fault, perhaps, in an Oxford divine, as such, but not in perfect keeping with the inductive reasonings of the same writer as a man of science. . Whether there were more bishops than one at the same time in Corinth, is a question of fact; settle it if you can, by appropriate evidence, but do not assume the answer as an *à priori* certainty. Of the same conjectural character is what is said in explanation of Polycarp’s inculcating obedience to presbyters and deacons, without alluding to the bishop; ‘he does not specify the bishop, possibly from a fear of appearing to magnify his own office:’ it is, however, equally possible, and more probable, that Polycarp’s ‘presbyters and deacons,’ included the bishops, as Mr. Coneybeare himself understands St. Paul’s ‘bishops and deacons,’ as ‘including the order of presbyters.’

The audience addressed in these lectures would respond, we doubt not, with the most unaffected complacency to the pleasing picture of the church of England which closes the fifth lecture, fully believing that she is all that a Father of the second century would have desired. Far from us be the wish to disturb that complacency. We have no rude sweeping attack to make upon the church of England. But do these learned men not perceive what they are doing, when they take the *second* century, *not* the first, as their standard, exchanging the inspired teachers of Christianity for those who were not inspired? How is it that they so uniformly confound the episcopal government of each congregation of believers in the days of Ignatius, of Irenæus, and even so late as Cyprian, with the *diocesan* episcopate of the church of England? How is it that, in their comparison of ‘our

church' with the churches of early times, they so constantly forget that the bishop of old was *chosen*, and that he was *aided in his judgments* by the congregation in which he presided? Why do they invariably overlook the fact that—on their own showing—the early churches had lost much of their simplicity both in doctrine and in government, before it became possible for them to be blended with the institutions, and moulded by the authority, of the Roman empire? Whence is it that the only points in which 'our church' differs from thousands of other churches are precisely those in which you cannot plead the examples of the first three centuries, and in which your most learned writers acknowledge that she differs from all the churches in the age of the apostles?

These modern vauntings of patristic lore, and of patristic authority, are curious. They are instructive. They suggest some not very gentle trains of thought. It just occurs to our recollection, that in page 362, Mr. Coneybeare quotes Tertulian's description of the enemies of the truth as strikingly applicable to the conduct of the political dissenters of the present day. Was there any occasion for such a note? Is it in good taste? We will only say, that it cannot but be felt as offensive, because unjust, to men with whom, we believe, Mr. Coneybeare would sympathise as lovers of the truth, and sincerely '*humiles et blandi, et summissi*,' much more fully than with the majority of the teachers of the church which he adorns.

Notwithstanding these and many other blemishes, which are partly owing to the lecture's hurried preparation, and partly to the air of Oxford, we are happy in expressing our admiration of these lectures. Though the style is neither terse nor brilliant, we have some pleasant reading. We are led through some of the less frequented haunts of Christian literature with a graceful intelligence. The fruits of large and varied reading are modestly presented. More emphasis, indeed, might have been laid on the mistakes of the early Fathers. To account for the imperfections of good men; to bear with them, to accept their instructions and their services notwithstanding them, is wise and honourable: to palliate the really evil in any man is neither the one nor the other. The best uninspired men are poor guides in religion.

The reasons they give for their belief, rather than the fact that they did believe, will influence the faith of well instructed Christians. To know *what* the Fathers believed, and *why* they believed, destroys the charm of the authority which is claimed for them, but which they themselves would have trembled to put forth.

Another work of which we wish to give a short notice, is 'The Theology of the Early Christian Church,' by James Bennett, D.D., a work which, though not exactly what we could wish in point of taste, or of scholar-like method, is honourable to the industry and the sagacity of the writer. It is defective in points of interest—in historical allusions, in biographical sketches, in fulness and variety of illustration—in those innumerable and indescribable qualities which are the usual indications of a highly accomplished writer; yet it abounds in clear statements of theology, in copious extracts, and in quaint and homely appeals. By a fairly selected induction of passages from all the writers he has specified, he proves that the early Fathers regarded the Holy Scriptures with the same devout deference in which they are now held by the great body of Protestants; and in the course of this induction, he indulges in sarcastic observations on all who differ from the Fathers in this respect. On the somewhat difficult question—difficult, we mean, as a patristic question—of *Tradition*, he has shown that the tradition of the earliest fathers included only the doctrine handed down in the writings of the inspired teachers; that their successors were lured away from this ground by the boastings of heretics;—that it was the opinion of nearly all the Fathers—an erroneous opinion, as may be easily proved—that all the wisdom of the ancients, including the famous Sybilline prophecies, were testimonies, prepared beforehand, to the truth of the Christian religion; and that, as in process of time many doctrines and usages crept into the church, which are certainly not taught in Scripture, the only account that could be given of them was, that they were the traditions of the church. The inconsistency of this regard for unwritten tradition with avowed deference to the exclusive authority of Scripture is, indeed, most glaring; but it is, in many cases, the inconsistency of one set of men with another set of men: where it happens to be the inconsistency of the same writer in separate passages of his works, those who bow to the authority of these inconsistent teachers must get over the difficulty as they can. In our apprehension, there is no getting over it with a clear conscience. We can go with the Fathers, while they follow the Scriptures, which they acknowledge to be divine: when they leave that standard, misunderstand it, or add anything to it, we are warranted, and indeed bound, to part company with them.

It is natural to suppose, that the unity and the attributes of God would deeply engage the early converts of the Gospel, in their passage from the darkness of polytheism to the freshness and splendour of the truth. Though their descriptions are

exceedingly inferior to those which have resulted from the deeper thought, larger knowledge, and juster discrimination of modern divines, they will ever be read with interest by all who are qualified to contrast them with the sublimest conceptions of the heathen philosophers or poets. We should be glad to offer some noble specimens of what we mean; but it is impossible to convey, in that manner, the full impression of their spirituality and grandeur. Some faults are too apparent in the best of them: on these we need not dwell, as they are the natural products of the luxuriant imagination so common in the East, or of the beautiful but shadowy idealism which the perfect language of Plato has preserved for the admiration of all ages. We cannot forbear remarking on the extreme childishness—to say no more—of holding up teachers so imperfect in the rudiments of divine truth, as the authoritative expounders of that truth.—We could cite numerous passages from the fragment addressed to Diognetes, from Clemens Romanus, from Ignatius, and from Polycarp, which go to prove their belief of the divinity of Christ; yet, on this subject, as well as the wider question of the Trinity, to which it belongs, the early writers express themselves, at times, in language which no rigid follower of the Athanasian orthodoxy would think it safe to use. It has long appeared to us, that the incidental and indirect references to the Saviour, in the Apostolical Fathers, are the strongest proofs of their faith: we regret that Dr. Bennett has not entered on this large and interesting field of research.

On the questions agitated in the great Pelagian controversy, the opinions of the early Fathers would be far from satisfying the followers of Augustine and Calvin, or even the evangelical Arminians of the present day. In some places, predestination, election, and grace, as held by modern Calvinists, are taught with much simplicity and devout feeling; others are ambiguously worded,—though a patient comparison of separate parts will bring out a consistent meaning; there are not a few passages in which the anxiety of the writers to guard Christianity from the reproach of fatalism, betrays them into forms of expression which neither Augustine, nor Calvin, nor Scott, nor Fuller, nor Williams, would have sanctioned; while there are others, which most evangelical believers of the present day would agree in denouncing as unscriptural.

On the vital doctrine of Justification, there is so little that is systematic in the Apostolical Fathers, that it would be unsafe to infer, from the bare fact of the absence of explicit statement, that they did not believe the doctrines taught so fully in the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. In the epistle of

Clement to the Corinthians, however, this doctrine is affirmed in the plainest terms. It is referred to in, at least, two of the epistles of Ignatius. It is clearly taught in Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians.

On that branch of theology which relates to the church, it has been proved, over and over again, that no Christian writer of the first, or of the second century, ever applies the term Church to a number of Christians that could not ordinarily meet in one place; that wherever there was an organized congregation of Christians there was a bishop; that there were many village bishops; that a church consisted of persons acknowledging each other as holy persons; that deacons were not the ministers of the word; that there might be more than one bishop in one congregation; that the episcopal *order*, according to Jerome, was not of apostolical authority, but of ecclesiastical arrangement; that the choice of the bishops and of the deacons was in the Christian people; and that neither the notion of an official priesthood, nor the use of prescribed liturgies, was held by the earliest churches: and yet the abettors of diocesan episcopacy are in the constant habit of referring to the early fathers in behalf of a theory which upholds the proudest usurpation in the history of man's ambition.

It is known that the Latin Fathers applied the word 'sacrament' to nearly every part of religious worship. In the Apostolical Fathers we find not a word respecting baptism; but in the insensible progress of corruption, language began to be used respecting sacramental efficacy which we recommend to the attention of those who cling to the ignorant fancy that this monstrous doctrine was the growth of a later age.

The asceticism of the Fathers led, by an obvious principle of human nature, to the corruption of morals. Refining the requirements of the gospel into a superhuman piety, the professors of Christianity soon became divided into two classes, the one aspiring to soar above, and the other content to sink below, the level of virtuous humanity.

We have referred to these modern writers on the Fathers in our own language, because a large portion of our readers are necessarily excluded from the writings of the Fathers themselves. We might have mentioned Reeves' translations of the Apologies of the Fathers, which are not without force and vivacity. But the writers translated by him belong to a later period than that within which the present survey is confined. Besides this, the introductions and the numerous annotations of the writer betray the vehemence which disgraced all English parties shortly after the Revolution, and they breathe, moreover, that tone of con-

servative *hauteur* which is never absent from the minds of men who defend Christianity for the sake of the church. He makes statements which we know to be untrue. Though he perceives the difference between accepting the testimony of the Fathers, and relying on their judgment, he lays down, as fundamental, the blind principle, that 'they *must* be our best guides to the understanding of the Scriptures!' He entertains the most exaggerated notion of the extent of their knowledge and of the power of their understandings; nay, he hesitates not to speak of them generally, as 'living in times of inspiration.' The reasonings by which he insinuates his favourite doctrine of non-resistance to tyrannical governments, would be laughed to scorn and torn to pieces, by the merest child in logic, if stated in abstract and precise terms. His mode of proving the Apostolical authority of the church government, which, he says, 'is not plain from Scripture,' would avail him little in a court of law or equity, in claiming a rood of earth; in ecclesiastical logic, indeed, it is the argument which satisfies the Roman catholic in acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope. Reeves' examination of Daillé on 'the Right Use of the Fathers' is a tissue of special pleadings, clever, no doubt, more than enough contemptuous towards a writer so much above him in candour as well as in knowledge, ostentatious in its display of patristic reading which is at best exceedingly partial and defective, and brimful of that spirit of *αλαζονεία* which Aristotle censures in reasoners, and which the Apostles, Paul, James, and John, condemn in Christians. Reeves did not know, or, if he did, his prejudice made him forget, that Fathers of the church, reformers, and some of the most learned men in modern times, agree in those views of the history of church-government which he thinks himself entitled to treat with levity and scorn. The arrogance of such pretensions deserves no quarter from the friends of truth, learning, and integrity. It may serve a few purposes of the bigoted upon the ignorant. But ignorance is not to sleep, nor bigotry to run riot, for ever. The time is nearer than some reverend boasters think, when the true, which is the *old* on these subjects, shall find its way to the vulgar, and will be as household sayings at the firesides of the English people. An end is coming to every opinion, ay, to every institution, which cannot be defended without overlooking, forgetting, or denying what has been proved to be true! Truths overborne are not destroyed. The influence of rank and station, and of character for knowledge, is very powerful. However, it is not omnipotent. Even now, principles are boldly enounced in high places for the whispering of which men of other times were made to feel the iron hand of power,

and the withering insolence of office. Authority has no more to do with the interpretation of Scripture than it has with expounding the silent chronicle of the rock and the wondrous story of the stars, with determining the properties of curves or ascertaining the age of fossils.

Men are learning all this, slowly, but they are learning it. The Fathers are not the exclusive property of the priesthood. Men of independent purpose are examining them, and they see that their uses for certain ends have been sadly strained and grievously exaggerated.

We are naturally disposed to set too high a value on what has cost us much trouble, and too low a value on knowledge which we have not, and cannot have without more hard reading than we have ability, leisure, or inclination to pursue. It is scarcely to be expected or wished, that a large proportion of even studious men should spend much of their time upon these Fathers. But the result of years of study may be made known in essays and treatises of small bulk, so that the materials for judging of the real uses of the Fathers may be brought within the reach of the thoughtful; an end may be put to the vauntings of men of one sort, and to the ignorant credulity, or the equally ignorant scepticism of men of another sort; and the Fathers, like other people, may occupy their own place.

Let us now turn from editions of the Fathers, translations, and commentaries, to the *men*.

The most probable account of CLEMENT is, *not* that he was the person of that name honoured by the salutation of St. Paul, but, that he was one of the early converts of the first preachers at Rome, a man who, in that troubled season of the church, especially in the capital, could have been recommended to the episcopal office only by his piety and wisdom. With the hopelessly entangled question of the order of his succession we do not now intermeddle; we leave it for others to settle whether he was the successor of Peter at all, and, if he was, whether he came before Linus, or along with him, or after him, or after his successor, Anacletus. Of his sufferings and labours we have no certain assurance beyond what we gather from his First Epistle to the Corinthians, which the ablest critics have proved to be genuine and uncorrupted. This important document, with the exception of such fragments of it as later writers had preserved, was unknown to the divines of the middle ages. In the seventeenth century, Cyrillas Lucaris, a Cretan, Patriarch of Constantinople, brought from Alexandria to Constantinople a Greek manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, to which he appended this epistle of Clement. The Patriarch sent the manuscript to

Charles I. of England, by his Majesty's ambassador, Sir Thomas Rowe; in 1753 it was deposited in the British Museum, where it now remains.

It is not easy, yet we think it not impossible, to separate the true from the fabulous in the Pontifical Books, and in the Acts of the Martyrs, from which Baronius and other Catholic historians derive their account of this ancient bishop. All that Jerome says of him is this:—‘Clement, of whom Paul speaks ‘in writing to the Philippians, was the fourth bishop of Rome ‘after Peter, if, indeed, Linus was the second, and Anacletus ‘the third, though most of the Latins think that Clement was ‘the second after the Apostle Peter;’ then, after a brief mention of works ascribed to him, ‘he died in the third year of Trajan, ‘and the church at Rome preserves the memory of his name to ‘this day.’ Eusebius merely informs us, that he succeeded Anacletus in the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian; and he speaks in high terms of his epistle, which he says had been read publicly in Christian congregations ‘within my own memory.’ Clement is reported to have made many proselytes to Christianity by his sanctity and learning, whereupon P. Tarquinius, the Pontiff, and Mamertinus, Prefect of Rome, stirred up the Emperor against the Christians. At the Emperor's command, Clement was banished to the Chersonesus, beyond the Euxine. There he found nearly two thousand Christians condemned to work in the marble quarries. A great scarcity of water occurred at that time in the province, so that the Christians were forced to fetch it from a distance of six miles. Clement, we are told in the Acts of the Martyrs, being guided by a lamb to the top of a hill where there was a fountain, showed the Christians where to dig for water. When they had laboured in vain, the holy father stamped with his foot, and forthwith a spring was opened. The fame of this miracle, as is usual in such stories, spread through the whole peninsula, and so many were, in consequence, brought over to the faith, that in the space of one year seventy churches were erected, all the idols were destroyed, the temples were abolished, and the groves within a circuit of thirty miles were cast down! To stay this rapid progress of the new religion, Trajan, it is said, commanded Clement to be cast into the sea, with an anchor fastened to his neck; but the sea, retiring to the spot where his body lay, the Christians found it deposited in a sepulchre of stone within a marble temple! Another version of the story, adopted by Battista Platina, is, that his blessed body was cast on the shore, and being buried at the place where the miraculous fountain had sprung up, a temple was built over it.

Many reports of this description are, probably, founded in truth: the marvels have been added in later times. One source of mistake in the legends respecting Clement is, that he is sometimes confounded with a Christian of the same name, of whom we find mention, both in Suetonius and in Dio Cassius, as a man of consular rank, a near relative of Domitian, whom that emperor put to death on what will strike the modern reader as the oddly complicated charge of Judaism and Atheism. The earlier Christian writers make no mention of the martyrdom of Clement, the bishop, nor of any of the miracles which have been described. But we may easily learn from the Latin historians the state of Rome under the emperors, in whose reigns Clement lived, from Nero to Trajan; and the notices of the Christians by the classical writers, short as they are, give us some idea of the life of a Roman Christian, especially of a Roman bishop, in those days. In Clement's own epistle are touching allusions to the kind of scenes with which he was but too familiar. He accounts for the delay in complying with the request of the Corinthian Christians by a brief but graphic reference—like that of a hero to a field in which he had fought—to the sudden and perplexing calamities which had befallen the church at Rome; and after citing ancient examples of suffering 'for the truth,' he comes to the 'athletæ' of his own times, who had 'suffered unto death.' Of himself and of his fellow-Christians at Rome, he speaks as in the same *σκαμνα* (arena), waiting for a similar *αγών* (conflict). He must have witnessed the persecutions under Nero and Domitian; and it is not unlikely, although we have no authentic record of the fact, that he suffered death for his religion under Trajan.

The entire tone of his epistle is that of a mild and humble spirit, deeply imbued with grace, full of Christian affection, and earnestly intent on the things which make for peace. Contemporary with the last of the Apostles, with the grandsons of Jude, whose appearance before Domitian is so simply related by Eusebius, with Apollonius of Tyana, the champion of heathenism, whose life was written by Philostrates more than a century after his death, and with the earlier portion of the life of Ignatius, his days were passed amid scenes greatly different from those to which we are accustomed, and such as were well fitted to improve that union of gentleness with fidelity, and of sweetness with fervour and constancy, which composed his character.

It may not be without interest to the classical reader to observe, that, while Tacitus was pursuing those studies which qualified him to become the most valuable of Roman historians

—while Suetonius was forming those habits, and making those observations, which prepared him to be the biographer of the first twelve Cæsars—while the younger Pliny was cultivating the elegant tastes and the Roman virtues which lend so much attraction to his epistles—Clement was, in the same city, exploring the treasures of eternal truth, and with humility and meekness, and self-denying patience, preaching the gospel which these gentlemen deemed beneath the notice of their patrician dignity, and which they felt, if they knew anything about it, to be incompatible with those pursuits of pleasure, or of fame, which centered in the imperial court. What Byron calls ‘the solemn sneer’ of Gibbon against the Christians of that age, might be repeated with the same heartless mockery against the *profound and earnest* thinkers of any age; but we hold it for a sign of deeper philosophy, as well as of more manly morality, to sympathise with the obscure and suffering disciple of truth in labours which bear on the most lasting interests of humanity, than to imbibe the cold, proud, servile spirit of the men who, however wise or brave, professed adherence to the superstition of their day, but *dared* not study a religion which the Cæsars hated, and which the Roman populace hunted down with brutal fury. While the extremes of society joined in condemning the new religion, it was then, as it has been since in other countries, among the thoughtful and the virtuous of the middle classes, that Clement found the partners of his hopes, and the companions of his sufferings. By calling him a Pope, and by disfiguring his memory with the spurious honours of unattested miracles, the Roman Catholic writers have disgusted Protestants. Let us not run into the opposite extreme. The precious gem may be removed from its meretricious setting: in the clear light of historical truth we may commune with this lowly Christian of the apostolic age, learning from him the thoughts which fed men’s hearts in prison, in exile, and in flames, and which raised them above the gay temptations of the most joyous city in the most luxurious age.

The traveller in Syria, proceeding between forty and fifty miles west of Aleppo, comes to a city which the Turks call *Antaki*, on the left bank of the Asy, about twenty miles from the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. Standing in the midst of a fertile plain, ten miles long and five miles wide, and bounded by the mountain range of Omanus on the west, and by the northern extremity of the Tabel Akia on the east, the environs of the city are adorned with gardens of mulberries, figs, and olives, while the slender poplars lift their graceful forms along the winding banks of the river. The remains of ancient walls,

and a bridge of a hundred feet spanning the stream, remind the motley population—Mahomedans, Jews, and Christians—of the former strength of the Romans, and of the more ancient pomp of the successors of Alexander. *There* had been the royal seat of the Seleucidæ, and there the prouder palace of the Roman governor.

At an equal distance, seven hundred miles, from Constantinople and from Alexandria, *Antioch* was the queen of the East. Five or six miles eastward from the city, Nicanor had built a temple to Apollo, which Epiphanes enlarged and enriched; and the surrounding lands were laid out with whatever Grecian imagination and ingenuity could supply to feast the senses with sweet sounds and delicious fragrance, in groves of cypress with innumerable streams, or to gratify the taste of a refined superstition by transplanting to the rich soil of Syria the games of Olympus, the festivals of Daphne, and the fame of the Delphic oracle. Into this city of pleasures the gospel had been carried by the fugitives from the persecution which arose about Stephen. So great was the success of these preachers—who were not apostles, nor, probably, clergymen of any order, according to modern notions—that the church at Jerusalem sent to them Barnabas, who was soon joined by Saul; and Antioch, not Jerusalem, became the mother city of the Christian churches, their model, and the centre of missions for the world. For this reason—that is, because at Antioch the *catholic* and expansive character of the religion of *Christ* was first appreciated and acted out—*there* the disciples were first called *Christians*, in entire distinction from the Jews. In the reign of Trajan, the bishop of this church was *Ignatius*. From the correspondence of Trajan with Pliny, we learn what was the emperor's policy towards the Christians. On his way to Parthia, after his triumph for the conquest of Dacia, he passed through Antioch. Indignant at finding his will opposed by what he regarded as the rebellious obstinacy of the Christians, he summons their bishop to his presence. The interview is narrated with unaffected simplicity by those who witnessed the martyr's last sufferings; one of them a deacon of the church at Antioch, the other a deacon of the church at Tarsus. We will try to keep to the simplicity of these venerable narrators.

Trajan accuses Ignatius of wickedness: 'Who art thou, evil demon, taking pains to violate our orders, and to persuade others, that they may miserably perish?'—'No man calls Theophorus an evil demon; for the demons flee far away from the servants of God; but if thou callest me an evil to the demons because I am their enemy, I confess it; for having Christ the

'heavenly King in me, I cast their snares away from me.'—'Who is Theophorus?'—'He who has Christ within him.'—'And are not the gods manifestly with us when they fight for us against our enemies?'—'You err in calling the demons of the heathen gods; for there is one God, who made the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and all that are therein, and one Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, for whose kingdom I am longing.'—'His kingdom, you mean, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate?'—'*His*, who crucified my sin, with the inventor of it, and who condemned all the malice of demons to be trampled under the feet of them who carry Him in their hearts.'—'Dost thou, then, carry the crucified within thee?'—'I do; for it is written, 'I will dwell in them, and walk in them.''

The sentence is pronounced—that Ignatius be sent to Rome, to be thrown to the wild beasts in the amphi theatre. The martyr hears the sentence with joy and praise to God; and commending to the Lord, with many prayers and much weeping, the church which he had served for forty years, he prepares for his departure. We follow him down the Orontes to Seleucia, where he embarks, attended by a guard of Roman soldiers. We trace his voyage to Smyrna, where he spends some refreshing days in converse with Polycarp, and with the bishops of the neighbouring churches. Coasting along the shore of Asia Minor to Troas, he crosses the Ægean Sea to Neopolis, in Macedonia; travels by land through the rugged hills which divide Macedonia from Epirus; thence embarking on the Adriatic, he proceeds by sea to Puteoli, where he wishes to land, that he may tread in the steps of Paul, walking from this place to Rome; but the ship being driven back by a head-wind, he continues his voyage to Ostium, where having landed, he is hurried by the guards that he may reach Rome in time for the spectacles celebrated at this season before an extraordinary concourse of the people. The remainder is a scene which we cannot paint. Tacitus could have described it with a coolness which Gibbon might applaud. The Roman people's fondness for these shows was encouraged by their rulers, we believe, to divert their attention from the vices of the internal government, as well as for the purpose of keeping up that fierce spirit which made them the conquerors of the world. We have proof enough in the annals of Tacitus that no criminals thrown to the lions afforded the spectators a delight equal to the savage joy with which they gloated on the destruction of the Christians. When, therefore, a venerable bishop from the East, where Trajan was rivalling the glories of Pompey and of Cæsar, was sent to be exposed, it seemed as though the hated religion was led a captive to grace the triumph of the conqueror, to swell the

pride of the Romans, and to conciliate the favour of the gods. We do not sympathise in the wonder of Scaliger, and other scholars, that Trajan should remove Ignatius from Antioch, where his virtues had made him popular, to Rome. The punishment was more terrible at Rome than it could be at Antioch. The dangers and the troubles of the journey seemed likely to bend the spirit and to shake the faith of an aged man; his absence from Antioch would weaken the Christian cause in that city; while his death at Rome would strike terror into his party throughout the empire. Trajan, in common with all the heathen emperors, regarded the religion of the Capitol as the foundation of Roman greatness. We learn from Cicero, from Valerius Maximus, from the frequent consultation of oracles, from the Latin poets and historians, from votive tablets and inscriptions, from the appeals of the Christian apologists, and from the confession of those who abandoned the Pagan for the Christian faith, that belief in the religion of Rome was, generally, both more sincere and stronger than Gibbon would lead his readers to imagine. There are many traces of this in the epistles of Pliny; in his Panegyric on Trajan, he praises him for his 'præcipua sanetitas,' eminent devotion to the gods of Rome. How mild soever the directions sent by Trajan to Pliny for the treatment of Christians in his province, we cannot read the commentaries of Vossius on those epistles, nor, indeed, the epistles themselves, without perceiving that this was the coolness of a politician believing it to be the best mode of quenching a dangerous superstition, rather than the liberality of a philosopher disposed to tolerate a religion which, with all other religions, he despised.

Ignatius is better known—by one party venerated, by another discarded—as the advocate of episcopacy, than as a humble and suffering believer of the gospel. Whatever might be his reasons for so strongly urging the episcopal authority, whatever the extent may be in which his anxiety on this head was a departure from the tone of earlier days, whatever mischiefs to the church have arisen from the use which other men have made of what he wrote, we confess that the repeated study of his epistles has raised our admiration of his practical prudence, his glowing spirit of devotion, his strong attachment to the gospel, his fervent charity to Christians, his matchless courage, his constancy even to a dreadful death. In our coolest moods we blame him for some excess, both in his zeal for his office, and in his desire for martyrdom; but happy are they who can pierce through these imperfections to lay hold of the glorious principles and the divine affections which made Ignatius what he was in such a

country and at such a time. We raise no shrines for martyrs. We observe no festivals to their honour. We light no lamps at their tombs. We chaunt no litanies on their anniversaries. We expect from them no intercession. Yet we envy not the insensibility that is neither touched by the memory of their graces, nor edified by the record of their sufferings. The 'martyrs of science' are remembered by the studious, and the martyrs of liberty, by the free: why should the martyrs of religion be forgotten by the saints?

Just before the commencement of the Christian era, Smyrna was described by Strabo as one of the fairest cities of Asia, built partly on a rising ground and partly on the plain, with the most regular streets in the world, embellished with porticoes and temples of white marble, and having its walls washed by the waters of the Meles, on whose banks some of the ancients believed Homer measured his immortal verses. This beautiful city was the seat of one of the churches to which the apostolic prophet sent the revelation given to him at Patmos. In the reign of the Antonines the bishop of the church was *Polycarp*. The information respecting him, which Eusebius had collected, or which Irenæus or Jerome has preserved, has been critically compared and carefully sifted; we offer the following account as probably true:—Polycarp had been instructed by apostles, or by some others who had seen Christ, and he was in the habit of repeating their sayings. He was chosen to be the bishop of Smyrna, under the direction of Saint John. He was distinguished by the gravity of his countenance, and the winning sweetness and dignity of his demeanour. When Anacletus presided in the church at Rome, Polycarp visited the imperial city. On one occasion, it is related, Marcion, the heretic, came into Polycarp's presence, desiring to be acknowledged by him. 'I acknowledge thee,' said Polycarp, 'to be the first begotten of Satan.'

In the persecution that raged throughout Asia Minor, under the reign of Aurelius, a young Christian, named Germanicus, strengthened the weakness of others, by great patience in enduring tortures. His death is witnessed by the multitude, who are alarmed at the courage with which the scene inspires other Christians. They suddenly cry out, 'Let Polycarp be sought after!' Unmoved by these clamours, Polycarp wishes to remain quietly in the city, but his friends persuade him to retire to a country house not far off, where he spends several days, according to his custom, in prayer for all the churches in the world. His friends, still anxious for his escape from his persecutors, induce him to remove to another house; but the

pursuers, having scourged a boy who knows the place of Polycarp's retreat, are guided to an upper room, in which the holy man is taking his evening repose.

He receives them with courteous ease, and obtains permission to retire for an hour of prayer, while they partake of the refreshments which he orders for them.

The hour being ended, they lead him on an ass towards the city. They are met by the commander of the guards who apprehended him. The commander takes Polycarp into his chariot, and as they travel slowly on, he asks—'What harm is there in saying the words 'Lord Cæsar,' and sacrificing to 'escape punishment?' For some time the bishop makes him no reply; but, at length, being urged, he contents himself with calmly saying, 'I cannot do it.'

He is brought before the proconsul, who admonishes him gently,—'Have a reverence of thine age;'—'swear by the fortune of Cæsar, speak reproachfully of Christ, and I will release thee.' 'I have served *Him* these eighty-and-six years, during which time he hath never done me harm, how then can I speak evil of my King—my Saviour?' 'I have wild beasts; to them will I cast thee, unless thou change thy mind.' 'Let them come.' 'Since thou art not afraid of wild beasts, I will consume thee with fire.' 'Thou threatenest me with fire that burns for an hour, and then goes out; but thou knowest not of the everlasting fire reserved for the wicked; why dost thou delay? order what thou wilt.'

So serene and heavenly is his look, as he thus speaks, that the proconsul is amazed. The herald proclaims, 'Polycarp professes to be a Christian.' A furious crowd of Pagans and Jews raise a shout, 'This is the teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians, the destroyer of our gods!' They will have him instantly exposed to a lion; but this is refused. They then bring dried branches of trees, and wood from their shops and from the baths, and quickly make a pile, standing ready with the fire. Polycarp loosens the clasp of his girdle, lays aside his mantle, and endeavours to put off his sandals. As soon as they have bound him to the stake, he prays in a subdued tone, ending with a loud Amen. The fire not consuming him rapidly enough, a Roman officer standing by sheaths his sword in the body. The centurion burns the remainder of the corpse after the Roman fashion, and then the Christians gather up his ashes and lay them in a fitting burial-place.

The Apostolic Fathers occupy a place by themselves in the history of the church. They were not inspired; they did not profess to be inspired. They were men of faith, and men of

prayer.' Their religion was love. In persecution, they were firm to their principles, or, as they would rather have expressed it, they cleaved to their Lord and Saviour.

To them the Christian religion was a *religion of facts*, not of dogmas, of spiritual power rather than of speculative opinions; their explanation of it was in their virtues, and their defence of it in the amphitheatre or in the blazing pile. They are witnesses, examples, illustrations of the truth which they received, as we are bound to receive it, from the commissioned and inspired ambassadors of Christ. They were followed by teachers in different circumstances, and of different qualifications, in some respects, from theirs—philosophers and rhetoricians who mingled the truths of Christianity with the speculations of men—and they, again, had their successors, who fashioned the simple institute of Apostles according to the models they admired or believed to be expedient. On every principle which Christians hold in common, the earliest Fathers are the best—Clemens, Ignatius, Polycarp, these are 'the first three.' Where shall we find three better men? more sincere, more affectionate, more conscientious? Deeper reasoners and riper scholars have abounded in almost every age; but we have no idea that any church has been blessed with holier, more believing pastors than those of Rome, Antioch and Smyrna, in the first age.

X What is the Christianity against which, and for which the civilised world has been agitated for eighteen centuries? The Apostolic Fathers learned it from the Apostles, who were inspired of God to teach it. We would not minister to the prejudices of the ignorant. Neither have we any incense to offer to the vanity of the learned. To both alike we say, with equal boldness, there are older writings than the oldest of the Fathers, and from these writings, by humble, devout and submissive study, the wisest and holiest Fathers drew whatever spiritual truth they believed for themselves, or taught to others; these older writings, we are confident in saying, are easier to understand than any writings of any of the Fathers; they are the richest inheritance, ever touched by mortal hands; and they will be studied when the Fathers, having served the church which they have unwittingly deceived, will sink into the oblivion, which will be, in truth, their highest glory. Could the spirits of these men revisit our earth, what, may we conceive, would be their feelings?—Clemens, looking on the long roll of names with which his own is associated, as the Popes of Rome; Ignatius, shrinking from the threshold of the mosque at Antioch; Polycarp, wandering through the desolations of Smyrna; and all three beholding the errors, crimes, and miseries which have cursed the

nations, under the pretence of following the traditions of the Fathers? Happily for these 'just men made perfect,' we have no power to bring their spirits back to the sadness of such sights. If aught could disturb the peace of the blessed, it would be to see what we, who are groping here amid the shadows of earth are all too patiently beholding, the names of these very Fathers used for a purpose which would have filled their hearts with horror. Let any man quote Newton, as an authority for putting down the free study of the laws of nature, or Milton, for trampling on the rights of nations—millions are prepared to denounce his falsehood, or to scout his folly; even if the great philosopher and the great patriot had affirmed what we know to be the exact contrary of what their works were written to uphold, what weight could their names and their sayings give to such monstrous and mischievous doctrines? In like manner, let him who quotes the Fathers as authorities for fettering the free study of the word of God, or for tampering with the liberties of Christian churches, be met by sensible and religious men with this short answer: We know that the earliest and best of the Fathers taught no such things; if they did, we abjure their teaching, we reject their authority, we repudiate them, and all who follow them, as haters of truth, enemies to man, and rebels against God.

ART. V. (1.) *Contributions to the Mathematics of Phrenology.* By JAMES STRATON. Aberdeen, 1845. pp. 35.

(2.) *The Brain and its Physiology; a Critical Disquisition on the Methods of Determining the Relations between the Structure and Functions of the Encephalon.* By DANIEL NOBLE, M.R.C.S. Eng, London, 1846. pp. 450.

HALF a century has elapsed since Dr. Gall first announced to the world the elements of that system now known to us as Phrenology. This science, if science it may be called, has long since run the gauntlet of public opinion; it has outlived the first ardour of its supporters and the early virulence of its foes. Fifty years ~~have been~~ afforded for its establishment or refutation. In every enlightened country it has supported, during a long period, its public lecturers and periodicals; it has been made the subject alike of metaphysical and physiological investigation; the lights of science have been brought to bear upon it: anatomy, human and comparative; pathology, experiments upon living animals,

and numerous other sources more or less direct, have been assiduously ransacked for evidence of its truth or falsehood. And now, when a critical inquiry into the functions of the brain, by a member of the medical profession, who is favourably known as a contributor to the medical periodicals of the day, has been offered to the public, claiming for Phrenology the rank of an inductive science, we are surely in a favourable position calmly to review the evidence which has been accumulated in favour of Phrenology, and dispassionately to ask whether or not it affords a correct physiology of the Brain, and a true picture of the human mind.

It may be remarked, at the outset of our inquiry, that Phrenology is not generally regarded by our most esteemed physiologists and metaphysicians as an ascertained part of their respective sciences. By the greater number of them it is more or less discredited: some utterly repudiating the entire system; others professing to believe certain of its general principles, but refusing to assent to the details. On the other hand, there are a few men of eminence, both in natural science and in letters, who have given their entire adherence to the system, and lent their aid in its support.

We make this general statement, for the purpose of pointing out that there must be some uncertainty in the nature of that evidence upon which the system rests. If the evidence were of the same nature as that upon which other inductive sciences are founded, Phrenology would, long ere this, have been either generally acknowledged or universally abandoned by scientific inquirers. Upon what, then, does this uncertainty depend? In what respect do the facts and observations of Phrenology differ from those of Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, and Mechanics? In this respect: they want precision and accuracy. They are not definite, nor tangible, nor mensurable. They are chameleon-like in their colour, and proteus-like in their form. The terminology of the system is altogether inexact. It has no place in other inquiries. The terms *large* and *small*, *full*, *rather full*, and such like, are altogether repudiated by the observers of nature in other departments. They have no existence in the vocabulary of science, and convey no meaning, or at least no truth that is at all worthy of confidence. If a thing is large, what is the size of it? if it is small, tell us the measurements.

Let us look a little more narrowly at the facts and principles of Phrenology. It proceeds upon certain postulates, which it contends are either substantiated by evidence, or such as will be readily granted by all parties. These are,—that the brain is the organ of the mind; and that the size of an organ is, *ceteris*

paribus, a measure of its power. These principles being granted, it is said that observation has determined that individuals having certain faculties or propensities in an eminent degree, have certain parts of the brain proportionably *large*, and, therefore, that those particular parts of the brain manifest particular faculties of the mind. From these observations and conclusions it results that the brain is a congeries of organs, each of which is connected with a particular mental faculty; and that the size of each organ, and the power of the corresponding faculty, may be estimated by an examination of the external surface of the head or cranium. The observations which are said to have determined these facts may be described historically as follows:—Dr. Gall remarked that a certain individual who displayed great mental powers of a certain kind—say, e. g., of making numerical calculations—had a fulness or prominence in a certain part of the forehead. He found that other persons similarly endowed had a similar fulness. Hence he inferred that the part of the brain under that prominence was larger than usual; that that part of the brain was the organ of Number, and that Number was a distinct faculty of the human mind. Proceeding in this way, he found that particular dispositions and propensities, strongly developed in different individuals, were associated always with fulness or greater size of other parts of the cranium. He thus succeeded in peopling the surface of the brain with the thirty-five phrenological faculties. Dr. Gall was followed by Dr. Spurzheim, Mr. Combe, and others, who, from an extended series of observations, verified, with some modifications, the conclusions of the author of this system. The result of the whole of the phrenological inquiries is, that we now have the surface of the cranium mapped out into thirty-five or thirty-seven compartments, each of which covers the organ of a certain faculty, and that the mind is made up of these thirty-five or thirty-seven faculties. The entire truth of the system, it is to be remarked, rests upon the assertion that, in the opinion of a certain number of observers, in a vast number of instances, remarkable activity or power of the so-called faculties or propensities has been always found associated with large size of that part of the cranium which indicates them; and that great deficiency of those faculties or propensities has been accompanied with diminished size of the corresponding organs and parts of the cranium covering them.

Phrenology has had numerous assailants. Some have attacked it with the shafts of ridicule. Some have argued against it on metaphysical grounds, contending that the theory which it gives of the mind is inconsistent with our own consciousness. Others

have attempted to invalidate the system, by showing its inconsistency with the structure of the cranium and the anatomy of the brain. Others, again, have opposed to it facts derived from the development of different parts of the brain, both in man and in the lower animals. And, lastly, pathological observations and experiments upon living animals have been adduced as leading to conclusions subversive of the phrenological system.

Amidst this host of assailants the phrenologists have manfully kept their ground; defending themselves, indeed, with indifferent success, but still fighting with their backs to the wall reared for them by their facts and observations. 'Disprove our facts,' say they, 'but while they remain, we care not for your theoretical objections. If our facts are true, we scorn your theories;—ours is an inductive science.'

'In no other way,' says Mr. Noble, 'can Gall's physiology be judged; it is altogether an affair of fact, which observation alone can determine.' * * * 'Settle, in the first place, the direct question of fact, then reason, mutilate animals, compare anatomical structure in diverse species, conjecture psychical correspondence, give the best explanation you may to morbid phenomenon; but decide, first, upon the validity of the phrenological facts.'—pp. 212, 213.

To the facts they appeal, and properly; to these facts then let us first direct our attention, reserving our criticism on those collateral points to which we have referred, and to which Mr. Noble directs himself at some length, for the subsequent part of our remarks.

The facts upon which Phrenology professes to be founded have been often disputed, and their accuracy denied. But the *pros* and *cons* on this point have been found to be altogether unsatisfactory, and such as to leave either party more strongly convinced of the truth of their own opinions. Here are instances, says one, in which the organ of, e. g., Destructiveness was large, and yet the individuals manifested no such propensity. Oh, says one phrenologist, the organ was inactive and inoperative from want of exercise or cultivation;—or, says another, it was held in abeyance and control by other faculties; or perhaps, says another, learned in anatomical niceties, there was a deficiency of the grey matter of the brain, or a defect in the quality of it;—size is a measure of power *only ceteris paribus*. But, says the objector, if there are all these exceptions to your rules, there are as many sources of fallacy in the observations upon which your system is founded; it must be, after all, very doubtful whether, amidst the exceptions, you have hit upon the rule. We appeal, retorts the phrenologist, to the most ex-

tended series of observations; and to the skulls and casts of innumerable persons whose characters are well known;—to those of poets, historians, musicians, artists, philosophers, men distinguished by their piety or benevolence, or notorious for their licentiousness and crimes. With the heads of such persons our museums are filled, and they all display evidences in their exterior form of the characteristics which distinguished the individuals; and upon these heads the truth of our system rests.

If the inquirer now proceeds to test the truth of Phrenology by the accredited examples upon which it is founded, he finds, if he is accustomed to rigid and accurate methods of investigation, all that uncertainty of which we have already spoken. He is told that if he looks at a certain part of this cranium or the other that he will see that it is 'full,' or 'rather full,' or 'large,' or 'very large' in one particular part; but the amount of this fulness compared with another head he is unable to ascertain. If he measures it by ascertaining how far the prominent point is distant from the ear, or any central point, and compares this measurement with a similar one on another cranium, he is told, if the result be unfavourable to Phrenology, that the heads are of different sizes—the one is large and the other small—or, if they are nearly alike in size, that he must take into account the breadth of the organ, as well as its prominence or distance from any central point.

Here the matter at present lies, and in this uncertainty each one is left to use his eyes and his judgment to the best of his ability, and form an opinion favourable or unfavourable to Phrenology, as he will in all probability do, according to the previous bias of his mind. We think we have fairly represented the *nature* of the evidence in favour of Phrenology—of the value or amount of it we have as yet said nothing—we deem it of importance to place the matter fully before our readers, in order that we may inquire whether there is any possibility of attaining greater precision, and of bringing the facts and observations of phrenology to an *experimentum crucis*. We think that there is. We cannot doubt that whatever differences the eye can see, the hand can certainly measure; and that there must be methods of mensuration by which the so-called facts upon which Phrenology is founded can be reduced to figures and verified to a demonstration, if correct.

'It is surely impossible,' says Mr. Straton in the pamphlet before us, 'to contemplate the amazing accuracy which instrumental measure has imparted to many departments of science,—an accuracy immensely beyond the reach of the finest unaided eye, and not feel a wish that some such services were rendered to phrenology. It is, indeed, easier

to conjecture than to certify, why so little has hitherto been done in efforts to render these services. It cannot be the difficulties which stand in the way. The human head is not an object which, either by its magnitude or its minuteness, its flexibility or its irregularity, defies either the application of instruments or the powers of calculation. It seems impossible that those differences in size which are so obvious to the eye cannot be measured by some uniform scale, and expressed in terms of definite known value. * * * That the ordinary specifications of size and proportions are all but intolerably painful, vague, and perplexing to some minds, is a fact publicly recorded by friendly hands with much ability, and much more bitterness than comports with beauty in philosophical disquisition. Stand the matter how it may, this much will be readily admitted, that the increasingly rigid requirements of scientific minds, the changing social arrangements, (?) 'the progress of individual improvement—in short, the interests of all (except the unprincipled quack) call for the utmost precision in estimating and recording size, which is, in the nature of the case, practicable.'

What 'changing social arrangements,' have to do with the matter we are at some loss to divine, but, thanking Mr. Straton for what he has so well done for the cause of truth by his measurements, we would address ourselves to the same task, and do what he has not done, bring Phrenology to the test of figures.

What, then, is the size of an organ in the estimate of a phrenologist's eye? It can be only its degree of prominence as compared with the neighbouring surface of the cranium, or its distance from some central point. Of the breadth of the organ it is impossible he can form any estimate, except such as depends upon the breadth or size of the entire head; for if the organs do not always occupy the same relative part of the surface of the entire cranium, it is impossible for any phrenologist to define the precise limits of their cranial surface. Will any phrenologist undertake to say that the organ of Benevolence occupies a greater relative portion of the surface of the cranium in one head than in another, that in one it encroaches upon Veneration, and in another, Veneration encroaches upon it? We think not. If he did, there would be an end of all certainty in the matter. The only estimate which the eye can form is and must be that which we have stated—the prominence of a part of the cranium compared with the neighbouring surface, or the distance of that prominence from a central point. This distance or degree of prominence is a matter easily ascertained by actual measurement, and accordingly, phrenologists have accredited this mode of observation by the use of the callipers, and have, in many of their works, reported careful and extensive measurements made in this way.

Now comes the real difficulty. The heads or crania thus measured, all differ in size, and it is thus impossible to compare directly the measurements of one with those of another. If they were all exactly of the same size, or rather capacity, we could compare those measurements with precision, and say at once to the fraction of an inch how much more tune Handel had than Haydn. We could then, if we had the distance of the central point of each organ from the external ear—say which preponderated over its neighbour, as compared with the corresponding organ of another individual.

This difficulty, we conceive, is readily got over, and once got over, we think Phrenology must stand or fall by the result. It is a well known geometrical principle, that similar solids are to each other as the cubes of their homologous lines, or, the cube roots of similar solids are to each other as their homologous lines. If, therefore, we ascertain the capacity of any skull, which may be readily done by immersing it in water up to a given point, and if we ascertain by measurement the distance of all the organs from the ear (meatus auditorius), or from each other, we can readily produce a skull of *any given capacity* preserving the same *form* as the measured skull, and having all the linear measurements precisely what they would have been had the skull measured been of the capacity required. We may thus convert any number of skulls into skulls of precisely the same *size*, or *capacity*, each one, however, retaining exactly its own *form*, and the same relative development of its different parts. This done, the problem is solved, and we can at once compare all the linear measurements of them with fractional accuracy.

For the purpose of ascertaining how far Phrenology would stand this test, we visited one of the oldest phrenological museums in the country, in company with a phrenologist of note, and a well known physiologist, distinguished for his habits of patient and accurate observation, and, with a phrenological bust before us, we carefully measured casts of the skulls of four murderers, Haggart, McKaen, Pollard, and Lockey. For the purpose of drawing a comparison between these and heads of persons characterized by intelligence, wit, imagination, the kindlier affections of our nature, the sentiments of firmness, courage, and morality, we measured the casts of the skulls of Burns, Swift, La Fontaine, King Robert the Bruce, and those of two females, Heloise, and Stella. These, we conceived would furnish many interesting points of contrast, by which the truth of Phrenology might be tested. We do not profess that these observations are sufficiently numerous for positive induction, but they may direct the investigation of others who have

leisure and inclination to pursue the inquiry, and who may agree with us in thinking that this is the only certain method of ascertaining the truth.

We may add, that the capacities of the crania were ascertained by repeated immersions in water up to a line running between the meatus auditorius and the junction of the frontal with the nasal bones, and a careful measurement of the number of cubic inches of water displaced. In making the linear measurements, one leg of the callipers was placed as nearly as possible in a corresponding part of the meatus auditorius of all the skulls, while the other, guided by the bust before us, and by our phrenological friend, was with the utmost attainable accuracy brought to the centre of the organ to be measured; and, while they remained on the cast, the measurements were read off by the gentlemen assisting from the other extremities of our callipers, they having first satisfied themselves that they were properly applied to the several organs.

The following table exhibits the actual capacities and measurements:—

<i>Capacities of Crania, in cubic inches.</i>		<i>Meatus to Occipital Spine, (Amativeness.)</i>	
La Fontaine	149.5	Bruce.....	4.57
Burns	147.7	Swift	4.40
Heloise	142.7	Lockey	4.09
Lockey	142.05	Pollard	4.4
Bruce	136.5	Stella	3.97
Swift	129.15	M'Kaen	3.97
Haggart	128.6	Burns.....	3.94
Pollard	122.9	Heloise	3.9
Stella	119.2	Haggart	3.87
M'Kaen	111.05	La Fontaine	3.82
<i>Long diameter of Cranium from Occipital Spine to Individuality.</i>		<i>Meatus to Philoprogenitiveness.</i>	
Swift	7.968	Pollard	5.21
Pollard	7.87	Swift	4.93
Bruce.....	7.8	Stella	4.83
Burns.....	7.68	Lockey	4.82
Haggart.....	7.65	Heloise	4.79
Lockey	7.6	Haggart.....	4.64
Heloise	7.59	Burns.....	4.61
M'Kaen	7.58	Bruce.....	4.59
La Fontaine	7.54	M'Kaen	4.55
Stella	7.5	La Fontaine	4.5
<i>Long diameter of Cranium from Occipital Spine to Comparison.</i>		<i>Meatus to Concentrativeness.</i>	
Swift	7.76	Pollard	5.52
Haggart.....	7.63	Bruce.....	5.4
Heloise	7.63	Swift	5.24
		Haggart.....	5.23
		Heloise	5.16

Burns.....	5.09
Stella.....	5.05
M'Kaen.....	4.97
La Fontaine.....	4.87
Lockey.....	4.65

Combativeness to Combativeness.

Swift.....	5.87
M'Kaen.....	5.28
Stella.....	4.89
Bruce.....	4.8
Burns.....	4.8
Pollard.....	4.6
Haggart.....	4.11
La Fontaine.....	4.06
Heloise.....	3.95
Lockey.....	3.84

Destructiveness to Destructiveness.

Bruce.....	6.2
Stella.....	6.12
Swift.....	6.08
Lockey.....	6.01
M'Kaen.....	5.9
La Fontaine.....	5.8
Pollard.....	5.778
Heloise.....	5.73
Haggart.....	5.5
Burns.....	5.18

Secretiveness to Secretiveness.

Lockey.....	6.14
La Fontaine.....	6.09
Bruce.....	6.05
Stella.....	5.98
M'Kaen.....	5.98
Pollard.....	5.9
Swift.....	5.87
Haggart.....	5.75
Heloise.....	5.56
Burns.....	5.472

Acquisitiveness to Acquisitiveness.

Lockey.....	5.84
Swift.....	5.76
Stella.....	5.46
M'Kaen.....	5.41
La Fontaine.....	5.41
Pollard.....	5.37
Burns.....	5.28
Bruce.....	5.25
Heloise.....	5.16
Haggart.....	5.08

Meatus of Right Side to Adhesiveness of Left.

Stella.....	6.04
Bruce.....	6.
Pollard.....	5.88
Swift.....	5.87
Haggart.....	5.85
Heloise.....	5.68
M'Kaen.....	5.59
Lockey.....	5.46
Burns.....	5.146
La Fontaine.....	5.12

Meatus to Self-Esteem.

Haggart.....	5.64
Bruce.....	5.60
Pollard.....	5.57
Stella.....	5.44
Heloise.....	5.38
Swift.....	5.37
M'Kaen.....	5.28
La Fontaine.....	5.25
Burns.....	5.18
Lockey.....	4.97

Meatus to Firmness.

Bruce.....	5.65
Haggart.....	5.65
La Fontaine.....	5.61
Stella.....	5.58
Swift.....	5.56
Heloise.....	5.56
Pollard.....	5.52
M'Kaen.....	5.38
Burns.....	5.28
Lockey.....	5.16

Meatus to Veneration.

La Fontaine.....	5.55
Haggart.....	5.44
Bruce.....	5.4
Heloise.....	5.38
Swift.....	5.35
Stella.....	5.33
Pollard.....	5.32
Burns.....	5.28
M'Kaen.....	5.23
Lockey.....	5.06

Meatus to Benevolence.

La Fontaine.....	5.51
Burns.....	5.47
Haggart.....	5.44
Stella.....	5.33
M'Kaen.....	5.28
Pollard.....	5.27
Lockey.....	5.26
Heloise.....	5.25

Bruce.....	5.15
Swift.....	5.03

Meatus to Comparison.

Stella.....	5.3
La Fontaine.....	5.27
Pollard.....	5.21
M'Kaen.....	5.1
Bruce.....	5.1
Burns.....	5.09
Haggart.....	5.06
Lockey.....	5.06
Swift.....	5.03
Heloise.....	4.89

Meatus to Eventuality.

La Fontaine.....	5.13
M'Kaen.....	4.99
Lockey.....	4.97
Pollard.....	4.96
Stella.....	4.93
Haggart.....	4.93
Bruce.....	4.9
Swift.....	4.82
Burns.....	4.8
Heloise.....	4.7

Meatus to Causality.

La Fontaine.....	4.79
Heloise.....	4.73
Bruce.....	4.7
Haggart.....	4.62
Burns.....	4.6
Lockey.....	4.58
Stella.....	4.57
Pollard.....	4.5
Swift.....	4.5
M'Kaen.....	4.45

Meatus to Individuality.

La Fontaine.....	4.98
M'Kaen.....	4.86
Bruce.....	4.83
Pollard.....	4.8
Lockey.....	4.77
Stella.....	4.73
Swift.....	4.72
Haggart.....	4.72
Burns.....	4.7
Heloise.....	4.55

Meatus to Wit.

Haggart.....	4.96
M'Kaen.....	4.14
Heloise.....	4.01
Lockey.....	3.99
La Fontaine.....	3.87

Bruce.....	3.85	<i>Ideality to Ideality.</i>	Stella.....	4.14	
Burns.....	3.84	Lockey.....	5.36	Haggart.....	3.93
Stella.....	3.81	Stella.....	5.11	Burns.....	3.93
Pollard.....	3.68	M'Kaen.....	4.97	Bruce.....	3.9
Swift.....	3.56	Swift.....	4.93	Heloise.....	3.84
		Pollard.....	4.91	Pollard.....	3.68
		Burns.....	4.8		
<i>Wit to Wit.</i>		Heloise.....	4.66	<i>Tune to Tune.</i>	
Heloise.....	4.31	Bruce.....	4.65	Lockey.....	4.66
Lockey.....	4.29	La Fontaine.....	4.57	M'Kaen.....	4.65
La Fontaine.....	3.97	Haggart.....	4.41	La Fontaine.....	4.47
M'Kaen.....	3.93			Stella.....	4.24
Haggart.....	3.9	<i>Number to Number.</i>		Burns.....	4.22
Pollard.....	3.78	M'Kaen.....	4.61	Bruce.....	4.1
Swift.....	3.72	Swift.....	4.5	Haggart.....	4.0
Stella.....	3.7	La Fontaine.....	4.42	Heloise.....	3.99
Bruce.....	3.7	Lockey.....	4.29	Swift.....	3.98
Burns.....	3.571			Pollard.....	3.93

These measurements being made, we took the cranium of Swift as being about the mean; and in accordance with the rule referred to, by the following formula, as the cube root of the actual capacity of any skull is to the cube root of the standard capacity, so is any actual linear measurement of the former to the corresponding linear measurement in the same reduced to the standard capacity, we converted the measurements of all the other crania into those of a cranium having the same capacity as Swift's. That is to say, we converted all the crania into crania having the same capacity, but each remaining similar to its original in *form*, and preserving the same relative dimensions of its different parts.

The following are the results, arranged for the convenience of reference and comparison under the different phrenological faculties:—

<i>1. Amativeness.</i>	Swift.....	4.70	<i>4. Adhesiveness.</i>	
Bruce.....	M'Kaen.....	4.63	Bruce.....	5.89
Pollard.....	Burns.....	4.599	Pollard.....	5.85
Swift.....	Stella.....	4.56	Haggart.....	5.71
Lockey.....	Haggart.....	4.53	M'Kaen.....	5.68
M'Kaen.....	La Fontaine.....	4.426	Heloise.....	5.61
Burns.....			Swift.....	5.60
Heloise.....	<i>3. Concentrativeness.</i>		Stella.....	5.44
Haggart.....	Pollard.....	5.49	Lockey.....	5.43
La Fontaine.....	Bruce.....	5.3	Burns.....	5.12
Stella.....	Haggart.....	5.11	La Fontaine.....	5.04
	Heloise.....	5.09		
<i>2. Philoprogenitiveness.</i>	Burns.....	5.08	<i>5. Combativeness.</i>	
Pollard.....	M'Kaen.....	5.05	Swift.....	5.60
Bruce.....	Swift.....	5.00	M'Kaen.....	5.36
Lockey.....	La Fontaine.....	4.8	Burns.....	4.78
Heloise.....	Stella.....	4.76	Bruce.....	4.71
	Lockey.....	4.62	Heloise.....	4.68

Stella	4.62
Pollard	4.58
Haggart.....	4.01
La Fontaine	4.003
Lockey	3.82

6. *Destructiveness.*

Bruce.....	6.10
M'Kaen	5.99
Lockey	5.91
La Fontaine	5.81
Swift	5.80
Stella	5.77
Pollard	5.74
Heloise	5.658
Haggart.....	5.37
Burns.....	5.16

7. *Secretiveness.*

Lockey	6.1
La Fontaine	6.09
M'Kaen	6.08
Bruce.....	5.94
Pollard	5.86
Stella	5.65
Haggart.....	5.61
Swift	5.60
Heloise	5.49
Burns.....	5.45

8. *Acquisitiveness.*

Lockey	5.81
Swift	5.50
M'Kaen	5.50
La Fontaine	5.34
Pollard	5.34
Burns.....	5.25
Stella	5.15
Bruce.....	5.15
Heloise	5.09
Haggart.....	4.96

9. *Caution.*

M'Kaen	5.78
La Fontaine	5.72
Lockey	5.62
Swift	5.6
Bruce.....	5.69
Burns.....	5.54
Pollard	5.49
Stella	5.44
Haggart.....	5.41
Heloise	5.03

10. *Self-Estrem.*

Pollard	5.54
Haggart.....	5.51
Bruce.....	5.49

M'Kaen	5.36
Heloise	5.33
La Fontaine	5.17
Burns.....	5.16
Stella	5.13
Swift	5.10
Lockey	4.94

11. *Firmness.*

Bruce.....	5.55
La Fontaine	5.53
Haggart.....	5.51
Heloise	5.49
Pollard	5.49
M'Kaen	5.48
Swift	5.30
Stella	5.26
Burns.....	5.25
Lockey	5.13

12. *Veneration.*

La Fontaine	5.47
Heloise	5.33
Haggart.....	5.31
M'Kaen	5.31
Bruce.....	5.30
Pollard	5.29
Burns.....	5.25
Swift	5.10
Lockey	5.04
Stella	5.03

13. *Benevolence.*

Burns	5.45
La Fontaine	5.43
M'Kaen	5.36
Lockey	5.35
Haggart.....	5.31
Pollard	5.23
Heloise	5.17
Bruce.....	5.055
Stella	5.03
Swift	4.80

14. *Comparison.*

La Fontaine	5.19
Pollard	5.18
M'Kaen	5.18
Burns.....	5.06
Lockey	5.04
Bruce.....	5.007
Stella	5.0
Haggart.....	4.94
Heloise	4.836
Swift	4.80

15. *Eventuality.*

M'Kaen.....	5.07
-------------	------

La Fontaine	5.04
Lockey	4.94
Pollard	4.93
Haggart.....	4.81
Bruce.....	4.81
Burns.....	4.78
Stella	4.65
Heloise	4.64
Swift	4.6

16. *Individuality.*

M'Kaen	4.94
La Fontaine	4.91
Pollard	4.78
Lockey	4.75
Bruce.....	4.74
Burns.....	4.68
Haggart.....	4.61
Swift	4.50
Heloise	4.49
Stella	4.47

17. *Causality.*

La Fontaine	4.72
Heloise	4.69
Bruce.....	4.61
Burns.....	4.59
Pollard	4.58
Lockey	4.55
M'Kaen	4.52
Haggart.....	4.51
Stella	4.31
Swift	4.30

18. *Wit (A.)*

Haggart.....	4.84
M'Kaen.....	4.21
Lockey	3.97
Heloise	3.93
Burns.....	3.82
La Fontaine	3.81
Bruce.....	3.77
Pollard	3.66
Stella	3.59
Swift	3.40

19. *Wit (B.)*

Lockey	4.26
Heloise	4.25
M'Kaen	4.00
La Fontaine	3.907
Haggart.....	3.81
Pollard	3.76
Bruce.....	3.63
Burns.....	3.55
Swift	3.55
Stella	3.49

20. <i>Ideality.</i>	21. <i>Number.</i>	22. <i>Tunc.</i>			
Lockey	5'33	M'Kaen	4'69	M'Kaen	4'73
M'Kaen	5'05	La Fontaine	4'35	Lockey	4'63
Pollard	4'88	Swift	4'3	La Fontaine	4'40
Stella	4'83	Lockey	4'26	Burns	4'21
Burns	4'78	Burns	3'92	Bruce	4'02
Swift	4'70	Stella	3'9	Stella	4'00
Heloise	4'60	Haggart	3'84	Heloise	3'93
Bruce	4'56	Bruce	3'83	Haggart	3'91
La Fontaine	4'51	Heloise	3'79	Pollard	3'90
Haggart	4'31	Pollard	3'64	Swift	3'80

On glancing over these tables, of the results of which we could have formed no possible preconception before our calculations were made, we may well ask ourselves, if they are correct, can phrenology be true? In a few points the results harmonize with the phrenological doctrine, but in others, and far the greater proportion, they are altogether subversive of it. Is it possible that two females, the accomplished Heloise and Miss Johnson, had more Combactiveness and Destructiveness than the notorious David Haggart—that Swift had less *Wit* in relation to the size of his brain and his other organs than all the other nine, and yet that phrenology can be true?

Let us glance over these tables in succession, and briefly examine the more obvious reflections which they suggest.

In comparing the measurements of the different crania, thus reduced to a common size, it will be necessary to keep in view the difference in size of the original heads, and to qualify our comparisons by the application of the acknowledged phrenological principle, that greater capacity, or greater size, gives greater energy to the whole character, but does not alter the individual peculiarities.

Beginning with Tables 1 and 2, it may be remarked of La Fontaine, who has the smallest organs of *amativeness* and *philoprogenitiveness*, that this certainly corresponds with the character of a man who left an accomplished and beautiful wife, who had done everything to captivate his affections and secure his esteem, for the sake of spending his time with the wits of Paris. On the entreaties of his friends, he set out with the purpose of reconciling himself to her; but on inquiring at the house, and being told she was gone to church, he immediately returned to Paris; and when asked about his reconciliation, he answered, that 'he had been to see his wife, but was told she was at church.' Equally careless was he of his son, with whom he soon parted. Meeting him afterwards, and not recognising him, he remarked that he seemed a boy of parts and spirits; and on being informed that this promising boy was his own

son, he answered very unconcernedly, 'Ha! truly, I am glad on't.'

The remainder of these two tables, however, is almost entirely opposed to phrenology; for, in the first place, Bruce is considered by phrenologists to have the organ of Amativeness 'full,' and we find that Haggart, Heloise, Burns, M'Kaen, and Stella, who all displayed this propensity to a great extent during life, have an organ of Amativeness half an inch less than that of Bruce, with relation, be it remarked, to heads of the very same size—nay more, they all have the organs less than Swift, who, says his biographer, 'was naturally temperate, chaste, and frugal.' What is the evidence afforded by history of the amativeness of the five individuals who have the organ so small? 'You have mistaken me,' says David Haggart, in answer to the question of Mr. Combe, who said, 'You would not be the slave of sexual passion?' 'You have mistaken me in this point of sexual passion, for it was my greatest failing, &c. ;' and he adds, that he believes he was a master of the art of seduction more than any that he followed. Is it necessary to mention, that all the intellectual accomplishments of Heloise failed to preserve her honour? and of Stella, we may only remark, that no two histories are liker each other than those of Abelard and Heloise, and Dean Swift and Miss Johnson. A writer in the "Phrenological Journal" adduces evidence from the life of M'Kaen, to show that he possessed strong amativeness; and everyone knows that Robert Burns was eminently endowed with this propensity. Of the whole five it may be remarked, that amativeness formed a distinct feature in their history, and gave a direction to the whole tenour of their lives and actions; yet they had organs three, four, and five-tenths of an inch less than those of men who were never characterized by this propensity. Nor can it be answered, that these organs, although absolutely smaller than those of Swift and Bruce, were yet large in relation to the other faculties and organs of the individuals themselves; for on referring either to history or the subsequent tables, it will be seen that the intellectual and moral faculties of Swift and Bruce were many of them less, and the organs less, than those of the five persons just named.

Again, convincing evidence is afforded in the life of M'Kaen, that he had the strongest regard for his wife and children. In his last farewell to them, he says of his children, that they were 'much the objects of his love, and he would retain for them to the last the highest regard as children begotten of his own body.' In the narrative of his life, he says, that after his capture he would have committed suicide but for the 'cruel

idea' of leaving his wife and family in prison, under suspicion of being concerned in the murder when they were totally innocent*—yet he had confessedly small Conscientiousness.† That Burns displayed in his lifetime great Philoprogenitiveness, we need hardly stop to prove; yet these two individuals have organs considerably less than those of persons who never displayed the propensity at all.

Of the measurements in Table III., little can be said, as the functions attributed to this organ are vague and ill understood. It may, however, be remarked, that if it gives permanence to ideas and emotions, the smallness of the organ in Stella is inconsistent with the theory, and that we would have expected a larger share of it in Swift, Burns, and Heloise, all of whom in their lives and writings abundantly evinced the permanence of their emotions.

The size of the organs of *Adhesiveness* in the different heads, appears to correspond pretty closely with what the characters of the individuals would have led us to anticipate, with one exception. Burns was certainly characterized by the strength of his attachments, yet he has the organ smaller than the other eight, and scarcely larger than La Fontaine, in whom the organ and the faculty were alike of the smallest measure.

Combativeness.—This table displays some facts favourable to phrenology, and others which are utterly irreconcilable with it. Lockey, a poacher and a murderer, has the smallest organ. Pollard, another murderer, has less than either Heloise or Stella, while Haggart, who was extremely apt to strike, has an organ which measures *one inch* less than Swift's, and *half an inch* less than Stella's, a patient and peaceable woman, and scarcely more than La Fontaine, a man of the utmost apathy.

In the organ of *Destructiveness*, Haggart also measures very little compared with others who displayed far less of the propensity, or none at all. He measures less here again than either Heloise or Stella, and *half an inch* less than the facile French poet. Burns, who displayed so much impetuosity of character, and wrote sentiments fired with energy, has the smallest organ of all.

Bruce has this organ very large, but still it does not exceed that of La Fontaine, so much as his exceeds those of Heloise and Stella, or theirs that of Burns.

The skull of Pollard, in which this organ is nearly of the same size as in Stella, smaller than in Swift or La Fontaine, and half an inch less than in Bruce, was that of a man who, accord-

* Narrative of the Life of James M'Kaen. Fifth edition, page 57.

† Phren. Journ. p. 605, vol. iii.

ing to a writer in the "Phrenological Journal," had evidently 'been labouring under an excessive excitement of destructive-ness which had become so habitual and ungovernable, as to 'give clear indications before hand of its existence and tendency.* He was a butcher by trade, and a man of very depraved habits. Under the influence of jealousy, he stabbed a man and his wife, and four children, his own mistress, and afterwards himself, the acts being committed with the most savage atrocity. Of this ungovernable propensity to kill there is certainly no evidence afforded by the form of Pollard's head. The organs of Combativeness and Destructiveness, are comparatively small; they are so relatively; for on looking over the other tables it will be seen, that this head is the finest of the whole ten in its phrenological development. He is not deficient in *Firmness*, having nearly as much as Bruce and Haggart, who are said to have had this organ prodigiously large. He has more *Benevolence* than Bruce and Swift, who were both considered charitable men; more *Veneration* than Burns, who is allowed to have had both the organ and the faculty large; larger *Causality* than Swift, and larger *Comparison*, *Eventuality*, *Ideality* and *Wit*, than either Swift and Burns, who both displayed all these faculties in an eminent degree. What, it may be asked, made this man a murderer? What induced him to be a butcher? How did he acquire depraved habits? Why, with such a head, did he not educate himself, and become another Shakspeare? We wish we had the skulls of Shakspeare, Milton, and Bunyan, we think we could match them, and shew a head that (phrenologically) *should* have beat them all—but it did not.

Similar remarks as to the counteracting organs—those of the moral sentiments and intellectual faculties, might be made in regard to David Haggart; they are considerably larger than those of Swift, Heloise, Stella, and Burns. He has as large a *Veneration* as any of them, save La Fontaine, who *displayed* none at all; he has larger *Benevolence* than Bruce or Swift; indeed, he has more of almost everything good than Swift. Nor can it be urged that he was instigated to his deeds of outrage and robbery by the desire of gain, for he has a smaller organ of *Acquisitiveness* than any of the other nine.

That Burns should have a very small organ of *Secretiveness*, and Lockey* a very large one, is not to be wondered at; the one was open and undisguised in all his actions, and the other was a poacher. So far nature and phrenology are agreed. Nor is it less in accordance with truth, that Bruce, who gained his victories more often by stratagem and surprise, than by open

* Phren. Journ. iii. p. 394.

attack, should also be largely endowed with this quality. But that David Haggart should have the organ so small, and La Fontaine should have it so large, compared with these men, are facts which cannot be reconciled with Phrenology, and which Phrenology can never reconcile with truth. Of La Fontaine, who has the organ *large*, his biographer says, speaking of his writings, 'he is truly original in his manner, which is so easy, so natural, so simple, so delicate, that it does not seem possible to exceed it;' and speaking of his character, he adds, 'his life had as little of affectation in it as his writings; he was all nature, approaching to the extreme of simplicity, or even stupidity, without a grain of art.'

Of Haggart, on the other hand, who has the organ nearly half an inch smaller than La Fontaine, the following is his own account of the faculty:—'As to this point, there were few that ever knew any of my secrets; even the best of them could hardly sound my depths, for I knew that if I could not keep my own mind, another would not do it. No man could ever say that he saw my countenance grieved, although I was in the greatest trouble of mind that a man could possibly be in.' Nor could the large 'Love of Approbation,' which Mr. Combe says he had, overcome the activity and power of this little organ of *secretiveness*, for he adds, 'the applause that I might have got, had I been desiring applause, was kept from me by my determined way of keeping my mind within my own breast, as I always did.'

Haggart, who stole night and day for four years, with unexampled activity, has the smallest organ of *Acquisitiveness*. With the exception of the poacher, none of the others, so far as we know, ever stole at all. Swift, who with that exception has the largest organ, and the least *Benevolence* of the whole ten, was not a thief; but although frugal, was 'a most kind and generous master, and very charitable to the poor.' The poor within the liberty of his cathedral, were better regulated than in any other in the kingdom; he built an alms-house for them, and preserved among them uncommon cleanliness and decency, 'by constantly visiting them in person.' La Fontaine, who has the organ also large, shewed little of this propensity, for on his annual visit to his wife in September, he always sold off some part of his family estate.

La Fontaine has the largest organ of *Veneration*, and, omitting Heloise, the next, in point of size, is Haggart's. Neither of them can, we think, be accused of a tendency to venerate what is great or good. The immoral tendency of La Fontaine's tales is well known. One of them, which contained a very profane

application of some words of Scripture, he dedicated to a celebrated divine. He dined on one occasion with a person of distinction, and though he ate very heartily, not a word could be got from him, until at last, rising soon after from table, on pretence of going to the Academy, and being told he would be too soon, he answered, 'Oh, then I'll take the longest way.' Racine once carried him to the Tenebræ, the Romish service in representation of our Saviour's agony in the garden, and perceiving it was too long for him, he put a Bible into his hands. Fontaine happening to open it at the prayer of the Jews in Baruch, read it over and over with such admiration, that he could not forbear saying to Racine, 'This Baruch is a fine writer; do you know anything of him?' On another occasion, hearing some ecclesiastics conversing on the merits of St. Austin, after a profound silence, he asked one of them, with the most unaffected seriousness, 'whether he thought that St. Austin had more wit than Rabelais?' In these two crania, those of Haggart and La Fontaine, the organs of 'the propensities' are small.

Of the measurements of Eventuality, we would only say, that surely this is the true organ of Destructiveness; we advise phrenologists to try it, for here all the murderers are at the top, and all the quiet people at the bottom,—La Fontaine excepted, who, for aught we know, might have been a murderer, if he had had temptation and opportunity.

The measurements of the organ of Wit require no comment; Swift has the smallest! Indeed, on carrying the eye over the tables, we think that the worst head of the series is that of Swift. The posterior region of the head is on the whole larger, and the middle and anterior regions smaller than most of the others.

With reference to the energy with which the predominating faculties of these ten individuals were manifested, it will be seen, by reference to the capacities of the different crania, that the smaller heads were, generally speaking, the most energetic. Swift and Haggart, who are rather below the mean, and should therefore have been least energetic and active, displayed the greatest energy and intrepidity of character; the one was the most absolute monarch of the populace in Dublin that ever governed; and the other displayed the most unwearied energy and perseverance in crime. La Fontaine, on the other hand, with the largest head of all, was a man of the utmost apathy, being the greater part of his life a mere dependant in the house of Madame de la Sabliere, who, when she had turned away all her servants, declared that she had kept but three animals in her house, which were her dog, her cat, and La Fontaine.

We have thus far, in compliance with the appeals of phrenologists, addressed ourselves to the facts of their system. We confess that our facts are few, but they are derived from accredited specimens of the evidence on which that system rests. They are as extensive as our time and our present limits permit. The measurements were made with a sincere desire to arrive at truth; they were made with the utmost care; the calculations are founded upon principles in which we cannot see any fallacy. The results are, to our mind, totally incompatible with the truth of the organology of this system.

Let us again turn to the work of Mr. Noble, and review what else remains to be said in defence of this 'inductive science.'

The principal scope of the writer is to show that other methods of investigating the functions of the brain than the phrenological are utterly inadequate, and have led only to vague, general, and contradictory conclusions. Our limits permit us to follow his argument only in a cursory manner; and, indeed, the discussion of the anatomical and physiological details which it involves, is more properly adapted for a purely scientific or medical journal than for our pages.

The first method of investigating the functions of the brain, commented on by our author, is that of experimenting upon the brains of living animals. Such experiments, he contends, have led to the most contradictory and uncertain results. They are performed upon the lower animals, and of the changes produced in them, by the removal of portions of the brain, we can judge only by external manifestations. The pain, and loss of blood, and destruction of other parts besides that intended to be removed, all combine to render it uncertain how much of the result is to be ascribed to the removal of the portion of the brain, and how much to other causes.

Now, although it must be admitted that there is much truth and force in these statements, and that accordingly many discordant *inferences* have been deduced by different experimenters from the vivisections made by them; yet, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that, cruel and unnecessary in many instances as such experiments have been, yet in the hands of our most esteemed physiologists, they have led to the most valuable and unquestionable discoveries in modern physiology. It has been by such experiments that the functions of most of the nerves have been discovered; that the nerves of motion have been distinguished from those of sensation, and the properties of the grey matter have been separated from those of the white portion of the nervous system. In several instances, erroneous inferences have been deduced from experiments bearing on these

points; and such instances are dwelt upon by Mr. Noble, as showing the uncertainty of the method; but he seems to have overlooked the fact, that even in the instances referred to, the errors have been corrected, and the truth discovered, by means of similar experiments more judiciously or more extensively conducted.

Mr. Noble's objections to such a mode of investigation are, however, of much greater force, in regard to experiments upon the brain itself, than to those on the nerves; and it is accordingly against the inferences derived by physiologists from vivisections of the cerebellum that he principally directs his attention. While we readily admit that a variety of inferences have been deduced by physiologists from such experiments, yet it would be easy to show that there is a remarkable accordance in the facts of their observations, and that these facts all tend to certain conclusions concerning the uses of that part of the brain widely different from those assigned to it by phrenologists. Were we even to admit that such experiments could lead to no *positive* conclusions regarding the uses of the cerebellum, it is yet quite possible that they may lead to *negative* results subversive of preconceived theories regarding its use. Mr. Noble appears to us to overlook this aspect of the question. The positive inferences from such experiments may, for the reasons he assigns, be unsatisfactory; the effects of the vivisection may be attributable to other causes than the removal of the portion of the brain cut away. The negative inferences, however, as respects any theory, may be complete; for if the animal continues to manifest the function assigned to any particular part of the brain after that part of the brain has been taken away, it is obvious that, whatever function it may have, it certainly cannot exercise that one which had been assigned to it.

A similar remark may be made with reference to the conclusions to be derived from the anatomy of the brain, and from the history of its development in man and in the lower animals. That a more minute and extended knowledge of the facts revealed by comparative anatomy will ultimately lead, combined with other methods of investigation, such as experimental and pathological researches, to the true physiology of the brain, we confidently anticipate; and that much has been done in these departments since Dr. Gall's time, every unprejudiced student of science will admit. Still, we do not deny that the positive results, as respects the functions of a great part of the cerebral mass, are very few indeed. This may be, however, and yet the negative results, as respects the phrenological theory, either in

whole* or in part, may be conclusive. These may be briefly summed up before leaving the subject.

On examining the brain, we can observe no trace whatever of any divisions corresponding to the different functions assigned to its different parts. Contrary to the assertion of Mr. Noble, we think that distinctness in function is, generally speaking, coincident with mechanical divisions in structure, observable upon careful inspection.

The brain, further, is seen to present a very large extent of surface, composed of convolutions having grey and white matter like the other parts of it, which is not in contact with the inner surface of the phrenological regions. The opposite surfaces of the great inter-hemispherical fissure, and the base of the brain, together present a larger surface than that peopled by the phrenological faculties. Yet this is a terra incognita. The phrenologists have disinherited more than one-half of the brain—they have made a complete mind out of the lesser half, and left nothing for the other to do. Is that unexplored territory inhabited by undeveloped faculties?—faculties which, when discovered and brought into exercise, are to lead us to that more exalted state of being, towards which the author of the *Vestiges* looks forward as the next stage of development in the future destiny of man?

Comparative anatomy, and the growth of the human brain, alike prove that the last part of the organ to be developed is the posterior part—that the posterior part is peculiar and distinctive of man; and that the lower animals, while they may possess the anterior lobes, the seat of the intellectual faculties, or even the central portion, the seat of the moral sentiments, are destitute of those parts where love of offspring, adhesiveness, destructiveness, and combativeness are found. These facts in the history of the brain are incompatible with the organology of the phrenologists. Mr. Noble may contend that we cannot identify the different parts of the brain in different animals; but the whole science of physiology is opposed to the alternative which he is compelled to adopt.

Pathological investigations have, as yet, thrown little additional light upon the physiology of the brain. They are yet in their infancy, and it is to be hoped that, ere long, they will lend their aid in the elucidation of this interesting subject. The results of our present knowledge of this subject are in some particulars favourable to phrenology; in others, they are the reverse. Many cases of disease have been collected in proof of the phrenological theory regarding the cerebellum; and although there are also many cases which tend towards a different con-

clusion, it may be admitted that, on the whole, the evidence preponderates on the side of phrenology in this instance.

The pathology of insanity appears to us to offer a wide and inviting field of inquiry. It is one which hitherto has been but rudely and unprofitably explored. It is but recently, if at all, that morbid changes, which are accidental and irrelevant, have been distinguished from those which are essential. The improved methods of treating the insane have been but too recently introduced; and it is but too lately, and far too imperfectly as yet, that the unhappy subjects of this malady have been removed from the mere *keeper*, and placed under the care of those whose habits of observation and scientific attainments could lead us to anticipate discoveries in this quarter. But when this department of pathological inquiry shall have been cultivated with the same industry and skill, and with the same aids and appliances as others, we may reasonably anticipate a rich harvest of truth. Meanwhile, we may remark, that mental pathology throws some light upon the structure of the mind, which, in our judgment, accords not with the doctrines of phrenology.

Insanity has been frequently appealed to by phrenologists, as affording corroboration of their system. In cases of monomania, it is said that satisfactory evidence is given of the existence of the separate faculties which they have assigned to us. In that unhappy maniac tearing his clothes, you have a proof of the existence of a separate organ for Destructiveness. In that dignified form, 'every inch a king,' you have diseased Self-esteem; and in that poor creature who fancies he is too large to pass through any door, however wide and lofty, you have disease of the organ of Form, and so of the other faculties. We have always thought that the popularity of phrenology depended very much upon the readiness with which it gave an apparent explanation of character. And here it appears to the same advantage, having all the apparent evidence in its favour, which a key has of being the right one, when it enables you to open the door. But the advantage is all in the apparent facility of the solution; for when examined more narrowly, it is found to be unsatisfactory and unreal, and very much like the solution which the physician gives to his patient, under cover of a solemn shake of the head, to the very difficult question, 'Why do I feel this pain here?' 'Oh, ma'am, it is the nature of the disease.'

Nay, the examination of the solution leads to a contrary conclusion; for it will be observed, that in the great majority of cases of monomania, the individual shows his insanity, not in

any *dérangement* of a *faculty* of thinking, but with reference only to *one object* of thought. In disease of the organ of Form, it is not a faculty of thinking which is diseased in its operations; the individual is in error only in reference to his own form, not in regard to the form of other objects. In disease of the so-called organ of Language—a familiar occurrence—in its most frequent form, the person loses his recollection of proper names; in its more marked degree, he loses his recollection of nouns in general, while, in other instances, the remembrance of an entire language is lost, and the individual uses the vernacular of early life, long before disused, and apparently forgotten. A native of Ireland, or of Wales, after thirty years' residence in London forgets his English, and talks only in the Erse or the Welsh of his boyhood. Similar remarks might be extended to almost all the cases of partial insanity vaunted by phrenologists in proof of their faculties. If they prove anything at all, they prove too much for phrenology; they prove that there are organs for nouns, and organs for verbs—organs for Welsh, and others for English—one organ for the estimate of one's own form, and others for the estimate of the forms of other objects. One individual with excited Destructiveness seeks only to wreak his vengeance on articles of furniture or to tear his clothes to tatters; another delights only in setting fire to the objects within his reach; a third endeavours to destroy himself, while a fourth seeks only the life of others. Are there, therefore, separate organs affected in each of these cases? If so, where are they, and if not, how can an organ be diseased in its operations with reference only to one object, and sound in its workings with reference to others?

We have pointed out these difficulties, not in a spirit of hostility, or prejudice, but, as we trust, from a desire to forward the interests of truth, by directing attention to more correct methods of observation and more extended inquiries than those to which phrenologists would limit us. We are fully alive to the services which phrenology has afforded to metaphysics, and to those which its founder has rendered to the anatomy of the brain. With reference to the former, while we cannot admit the large pretensions of some of Gall's followers, or that the thirty-five faculties of his system afford a theory of mind more in conformity with our own consciousness, or more nearly approaching to elementary faculties than the thirty-five innate faculties of Kant, or those of any other metaphysician; yet we readily admit that Phrenology has forced upon us more correct notions of mental *faculties*, as distinguished from affections of the mind, ideas, or the principles by which these, the functions, only, of

the mind are regulated. We have, at least, more accurate formulas, and a more precise language for our metaphysics, than we had before.

Of the brain, our anatomy, previous to Gall's time, was a description in Babylonish dialect of unmeaning and accidental heights and hollows. It is now advancing towards an accurate knowledge of its structure and arrangements, and the connexions between its different parts. When the comparative anatomy of the brain shall be fully known, and shall have been studied with reference to the habits and psychological phenomena characterizing the different animals in the scale; when the inferences from these observations shall have been corrected by experimental inquiries, and extended and confirmed by pathological researches, we may then, perhaps, begin to find out the 'True Physiology of the Brain.'

ART. VI.—*The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets, translated from the original Hebrew; with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical.* By E. HENDERSON, D.D. London, Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1845.

THE able Commentary on Isaiah, published by Dr. Henderson five years ago, is here followed up by a volume constructed on the same plan, and characterized, in a higher degree we think, by the same qualities of sound and varied learning, sober criticism, and patient examination, combined with deep reverence for the 'oracles of God,' and a pervading zeal for all the interests of Christian truth and piety.

Considered as a translation of the Minor Prophets, this is a great improvement on the received version. The number of variations in those minute particulars on which the perspicuity of a translation from Hebrew very much depends, is so great, that we feel ourselves bound to acknowledge the care and pains which they evince. We are the more concerned to point out these improvements as they are made, not on any arbitrary principle, nor in blind imitation of others, but with a clear perception of all the delicate modifications with which Hebrew scholars are acquainted, in the particles of that language, and for want of attention to which the clumsiest obscurities must darken what are, in other respects, faithful translations. For every deviation of this kind from the authorized version, Dr. Henderson renders a well sustained reason. Considerable

vivacity is given to these ancient prophecies by adopting the plan introduced by Bishop Lowth, of printing them as verses, and distinctly marking the parallels, so essential to the form of Hebrew poetry, and so often suggesting both the true reading and the correct interpretation. The version is in most parts rendered at once more intelligible, as well as more graceful, by substituting a simple word for another of less obvious or less graphic force, such as 'horn' for 'cornet,' 'raise a shout' for 'cry aloud,' 'he is behind thee,' for 'after thee,' 'punishment' for 'rebuke' (Hosea, chap. v.). A passage in this chapter translated in the English received version, 'Ephraim is oppressed and broken in judgment, because he willingly walked after the commandment,' can scarcely be said to give the sense of the original, or any sense at all, unless it be one quite contrary to the tenor of the context, to the doctrine of the entire Bible, and to the moral convictions of mankind. It is happily rendered by Dr. Henderson—

- 'Ephraim is oppressed.
- 'He is crushed in judgment ;
- 'Because he consented.
- 'He followed the order.'

For king Jareb (Hosea, v. 13), which is not the name of any prince, but the apocopated future of the verb לִבְרֹךְ to strive, Dr. Henderson, following Greek, Latin, and German versions, renders '*the hostile king.*' At the close of the same chapter, instead of the Rabbinical version followed by our translator, 'till they acknowledge their offences,' he gives, with much force, '*till they suffer punishments.*' For 'bound' (Hos. vii. 15), we have '*instructed.*' For 'knew' (Hos. viii. 4), we have '*acknowledged.*' For "cast off," (Hos. viii.) we have '*abominable.*' For 'Israel is an empty vine' (Hos. x. 1), we have—

- 'Israel is a luxuriant vine.
- 'He putteth forth his fruit.
- 'According to the increase of his fruit,
- 'He increased altars.'

For 'judgment springeth up as hemlock in the furrows of the field,' we have '*judgment blossoms like the poppy on the ridges of the field,*' (Hos. x. 4.)

For 'O Israel, thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah; there they stood; the battle in Gibeah against the children of iniquity did not overtake them,' we have—

- 'Since the days of Gibeah thou hast sinned, O Israel.
- 'There they remain.
- 'Shall not the war against the unjust overtake them in Gibeah?'

For 'when they shall bind themselves for their two furrows,' we have 'when they are bound for their *two iniquities*.' For 'I passed over upon her fair neck, (Hos. x. 10,) I will make Ephraim to ride;' we have, 'but I will pass on *beside* her fair neck; I will *place a rider on* Ephraim.' For 'Till he come and rain righteousness upon you,' we have 'Till he come and *teach you* righteousness.' For 'Upon her children,' we have '*With* her children.' For 'take off the yoke,' we have '*lift up* the yoke.' For 'my repentings are kindled together,' we have 'all my feelings of compassion are kindled.' For 'Therefore I *will* be unto them as a lion,' we have 'So that I *became* unto them as a lion.'

With innumerable improvements of the kind we have pointed out, Dr. Henderson adheres, in the main, to the words of the authorized version, seldom departing from them without substituting such as are better adapted to convey the sense of the original. We cannot but commend both the practical wisdom, and the good taste, of adopting this course; it preserves the force and richness of a translation to which our people have been accustomed, and it engrafts the improvements on it in a manner which shows that they were called for, while it commends them to the judgment of the intelligent reader.

We are not prepared, as the wily brethren of our craft usually say, to attest the perfection of all the renderings of this volume. At page 294, we mark the omission in the text of part of the verse (Hab. i. 3), on which, however, observations are made in the note, as though the words had been translated in the text. We presume, therefore, that it is an oversight of the corrector of the press. Other slight errors, especially in the printing of the Hebrew points, and the Greek accents, which will probably escape the notice of all but the most critical readers, will, we doubt not, catch the eye of the learned and accurate author, and be marked for correction in a second edition.

Occasionally we meet with instances in which the translator does not appear to us to have hit on the best word for expressing his own idea of the power of the original; e. g. in Hosea, xi. 6, the word חָלַל which, after the Rabbins, the authorized translators have rendered 'abide,' Dr. Henderson, following the analogy of the Arabic, renders '*whirled*'—a word scarcely applicable to the turnings of a *sword*, and to which we should prefer '*brandished*.' At page 88, the word 'excision' is not a happy rendering of קָטַב for which Gesenius gives '*lues, pestis*;' and which, in English, should be rendered 'plague,' 'ruin,' 'destruction,' or some more familiar word. 'Orphan' or '*fatherless*' is a better word than 'destitute' for יָתוֹם.

In supplying words to fill up the sense, where the idioms of the two languages differ, we deem it, on the whole, safe and satisfactory to print the supplied words in a different type, as in rendering the substantive verb הָיָה 'was communicated' in the beginning of several of these prophecies: and perhaps 'given' would be a better, because a simpler term than 'communicated' for this purpose. Dr. Henderson's translation of Hos., ii. 2, does not strike us as equal to the received version.

'A day of darkness and *gloom*,

'A day of clouds and *dense obscurity*.'—Henderson.

'A day of darkness and of *gloominess*,

'A day of clouds and of *thick darkness*.'—Received version.

In the same connexion, too, there is a chaunting tone in 'the years of *many* generations' which is lost in 'the years of *successive* generations:' generations, besides, are in their nature successive. 'Arranged for battle' is less picturesque than '*set in battle array*.' 'All faces withdraw their colour' is not so good as 'turn pale' or 'gather blackness.' '*Shining*' is more to our taste than 'shine' used as a noun. The '*servants and the handmaids*' we prefer to 'male and female servants' (v. 32); 'with sledges of iron' is, certainly, a literal rendering of הָרָצוֹת הַבְּרִזָּל; yet the meaning is imperfect without the insertion of the word 'threshing.' In Amos, i. 1, 'herdsmen' is more comprehensive than '*shepherds*.' We see no warrant, nor occasion, for inserting the article in the phrase 'covenant of the brethren' in Amos, i. 9. 'Calcined' is not so good a word as '*burned*,' in the beginning of the next chapter. 'Wine of the *amerced*' certainly conveys the exact idea; but we desiderate a simpler word than '*amerced*,' such as 'the oppressed.' For 'rectitude' we should prefer '*the right*,' or '*that which is right*.' The note on Amos, vii. 17, points out the true meaning; but the translation should have been somewhat different, to make the text and the note agree. 'Subject' is not a good word in Jonah, iii. 6: 'matter' would be better.' We see no advantage in substituting 'grandeers' for '*nobles*' in Jonah, iii. 7. Though the word 'cypresses' is very beautiful and accurate as a literal version (Nahum, ii. 4), such a word as '*spears*' would come more home to the English mind.

In the spirited version of this sublime chapter, we regret such a word as 'emptiedness'—and the recurrence of a phrase already pointed out: 'all faces withdraw their colour.' '*Crashing*' (שִׁבְרָה) in the common version, is more graphic than 'destruction' in Dr. Henderson's (Zeph., i. 10). We prefer '*sea-coasts*' to 'the line of the sea.' No reason is assigned for

translating יָד 'his head' instead of '*his hand*,' at the end of Zephaniah, chap. ii. 'Conciliate the regard of Jehovah' is not any improvement, either in sense or sound, on 'pray before Jehovah.' The word 'peg' for מַטְּבֵּי is, by itself, not more dignified, or more suggestive of the oriental idea, than '*nail*.' A paraphrase, or notes, must be used, in such cases, to bring out the idea.

These translations are introduced by a General Preface, and there is a special preface to each of the separate books. The General Preface contains a lucid sketch of the history of the Collection of the Twelve Minor Prophets, their arrangement, chronology, historical relations, figurative style, and prophetic character. The industrious author has

'Laid under contribution all the means within his reach, in order to ascertain the original state of the Hebrew text, and the true and unsophisticated meaning of that text. He has constantly had recourse to the collection of various readings made by Kennicott and De Rossi; he has compared the rendering of the Targum, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Vulgate, and other ancient versions; he has consulted the best critical commentaries; he has availed himself of the results of modern philological research; and he has conducted the whole under the influence of a disposition to place himself in the times of the sacred writers, surrounded by the scenery which they exhibit, and impressed by the different associations, both of a political and spiritual character, which they embody.'

The separate prefaces lay before the reader, within a narrow space, the fruit of much inquiry, and the outlines of many learned controversies. We might select from each of the Twelve Books passages exhibiting that familiarity with the oriental tongues for which Dr. Henderson is well known, together with a command of picturesque and musical English words, well fitted to convey the meaning and the tone of the ancient poetry of the Hebrew prophets. Of the Commentary, it is difficult to give anything like an adequate notion, excepting to those who are well acquainted with the same author's Commentary on Isaiah. As compared with that Commentary, the one now before us may, we think, be fairly described as more copious, embracing a wider course of reading, solving a larger number of philological and critical questions, and presenting a work to which we know not of any parallel in the English language.

There are several classes of readers who will be disappointed in this book. The Millenarian will see that the patient study of the language of prophecy, and of the connexion of the many

passages on which he has been wont to rely, will not bear out his theory. The ordinary readers of the Bible will be surprised to see that no ground is offered in the Scriptures rightly interpreted for the application of favourite texts to subjects with which they have been empirically connected, by the traditional habits of some popular commentators and preachers: they will be perplexed, too, by seeing the whole theory of *spiritual* interpretation, as they have deemed it, overlooked in general, and, in particular places, purposely condemned. There is one subject on which Dr. Henderson has expressed his views most decidedly in his Commentary on Isaiah, and has repeated them in the present work:

‘In no instance has the theory of a double sense been permitted to exert its influence on his expositions. The author is firmly convinced, that the more this theory is impartially examined, the more it will be found that it goes to unsettle the foundations of Divine truth, to unhinge the mind of the biblical student, to invite the sneer and ridicule of unbelievers, and open the door to the extravagant vagaries of a wild and unbridled imagination. Happily, the number of those who adhere to the multifarious method of interpretation is rapidly diminishing; and there cannot be a doubt, that, in proportion as the principles of sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the Word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality, and a more profound understanding of Scripture are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and vulnerable ground will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical and natural species of interpretation adopted and followed.’—pp. ix. x.

We heartily agree with the author in his anxiety for the ‘natural species of interpretation,’ and in his reverence for ‘the principles of Sacred Hermeneutics;’ nor are we disposed to offer a syllable in defence of the *double* sense of Prophecy. At the same time we submit, with all respect, that there is a danger of verging towards the opposite extreme, of treating the Holy Scriptures, *in all respects*, as though they were merely the productions of men. We are fully convinced that there is a solid basis for distinguishing the meaning attached to the words of prophecy considered as human words, or considered separately by themselves, and the meaning intended by the Holy Spirit in harmony with the entire scheme of Providence, *and the broad aspect of prophecy, considered as one system*. We are, likewise, convinced, that there is an element in the prophetic poems of the Hebrews, quite peculiar to them, which marks their divine origin, and which is essential to the full comprehension of ‘the

mind of the *Spirit*, as expressed in the written dictates of inspiration.' For this reason we are jealous—we have no wish to conceal it—of the principle of interpretation, which rises no higher than the level of the Anti-supernaturalists of Germany. If it be admitted, that the Hebrew poems are inspired, there is nothing irrational, but just the contrary, in expecting that they shall sometimes *mean more than can be apparent to those who deny their inspiration*. Did the Hebrew people fully understand the prophecies delivered to them? Are we sure that the inspired prophets themselves fully understood their own predictions?

The New Testament writers, generally, point out the peculiar position of the Hebrew church as a typical church, its worship a typical worship, its government a typical kingdom; and it is very apparent to us that, as some symbols of prophecy are taken from the natural scenery, and the usages of the Hebrews, others are deeply tinged with the typical character of the whole series of the divine dispensations towards their land and their people. Dr. Henderson avails himself of this principle, to some extent, both in his Commentary on Isaiah, and in this Commentary on the Minor Prophets. He applies the words David, Jerusalem, Zion, to Christ and to the Christian church. He regards Joshua and his companions (Zec. iii. 8.) as 'typical persons.' He describes the 'incense and pure offering' of Malachi as 'sacrificial terms,' 'transferred, from their original application to ceremonial objects and acts, to such as are 'spiritual, agreeably to the nature of the new economy.' He comments on Zech. xiv. 4, 5., as 'conveying in language of the 'most beautiful poetic imagery, the assurance of the effectual 'means of escape that should be provided for the truly pious.' We agree with the excellent author in his views of these passages; but we feel that in so agreeing with him, we press, and have a right to press, and are bound to press, the *symbolical* character of the prophetic poetry farther than it would be possible to press the productions of a merely human genius. Moreover, we are utterly at a loss to explain to our satisfaction the Messianic Psalms, without admitting that their reference to Jesus Christ is *based* upon their application, in a partial degree, to David, to Solomon, and to others, as types of Christ, precisely as predictions of His sacrifice are based on their application, in a partial degree, to the typical sacrifices of the Hebrew altars. We are as anxious as the esteemed author, or as Melancthon, whose simple words are adopted as the motto of this Commentary, to seek, everywhere, a definite and simple

meaning; but in a system of typical things, and persons, and events, we apprehend that we fall short of the *full intention* of the Holy Spirit, if, in any prophecy, we confine our regard to the interpretations which would exhaust the one meaning of any prophecy before it is contemplated as part of a whole revelation. Can anything be more certain than that we, as Christians, understand many prophecies of the Old Testament better, more *fully* than they were understood in the ancient time? But our vantage ground lies not in better acquaintance with the language, and the oriental imagery, of the prophets; it can lie, as we take it, only in our larger acquaintance with the plans of divine wisdom and grace to which the things regarded by the ancients as principal events, were only subordinate and typical. Let it be granted that predictions fulfilled—or yet to be fulfilled—in the history of the Hebrews, have been improperly applied by Christians to their own spiritual affairs; it ought, on the other hand, to be granted, that there is a splendour in the description of the returned captives from Chaldea, or of the restored wanderers from among the nations, which can be justified only by considering the external prosperity of that people as the shadow of a higher glory which they are to share with all ‘the nations of the saved.’ This appears to us to amount to no more than a *just* extension of the principle of symbolical interpretation, warranted by the nature of religion, by the analogies of poetry, by the peculiar constitution of the Hebrew system and language, by the undoubted practice of the New Testament writers, in their references to the Old Testament, and by the common consent of spiritually minded believers and expounders in all ages.

We are willing to go as far as any writer can go, in severely examining the natural force, and obvious sense, of every word of Scripture. We repudiate the entire business of allegorizing its facts, and precepts, for ourselves. We deem it a thing impossible to extract any meaning more *spiritual* than the literal meaning of any word employed by the spirit. But as the same light falls on the distant mountains and on their nearer shadows in the lake, so may we understand the same prophecy to apply to David, to Solomon, to Jerusalem, and also to the Saviour, and to the church, inasmuch as the one is held forth in Scripture as the type or shadow of the other.

Many Christian readers will regret that so able an expounder as Dr. Henderson should have abstained from pointing out to his readers, and urging on them, the sound practical application of the prophecies which he so faithfully translates, and so ably illustrates. Though we do not profess to partake of such

regret, we may be allowed to express a hope that other writers, and preachers especially, will avail themselves of the treasures of knowledge which Dr. Henderson has so profusely set before them, by bringing home the truths so learnedly elucidated to the 'bosom and the business' of every man. We tender our sincere and respectful thanks to Dr. Henderson for these precious fruits of his invaluable labours, venturing to express, in conclusion, our strong desire to enjoy the benefit of his practised skill and his rare attainments on the remaining fields of Hebrew prophecy.

Without the means of knowing, we would^a presume that he is preparing a translation with commentaries on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and that he will thus complete a series of works, deeply needed in the theological literature of our country, and which he is peculiarly qualified to supply.

ART. VII.—*Illustrations of the Croton Aqueduct.* By F. B. TOWER.
London and New York. 1843.
Metropolitan Sewage Manure. Report of Parliamentary Committee.
1846.

It has often been remarked that the great works of England have been done by individuals, each seeming to fight for his separate interests. But we may add, that these individuals have acted with as much unanimity, and followed up distinct courses as decidedly as if subjected to the voice of an approving or disapproving government. Such especially is the appearance of the works when finished; and when required we put our strength to the task, with as much of oneness in our aim, as if set like slaves to build a pyramid, with scant allowance of time and wages. We have done many things, and these things have become necessary causes for doing other things. At the same time we have sufficient encouragement to do; our works, when viewed as a whole, giving greater results than we could have anticipated, and at all times instructing, by presenting features which we could not foresee, and telling us that, however in some respects we may have done less, we have in other respects done more than we intended.

One of the great works which we are now about to examine, is the supply of water to towns, and the use to be made of it. The supply of water over all this country being comparatively regular, the demand has not been pressing except in

large towns. The importance of the subject is great, but little appreciated, because little known to many persons; looked on by many as a thing to be proved or experimented on, instead of a thing the nature of which may be seen by looking at the economy of every town, and the experiments on which have been made on the grandest scale from the earliest times, and by nations widely apart in the old and new world. Nations in the east have long rejoiced in fountains, and carefully made the most of their means, and the larger towns of Europe under the Romans were supplied with water from a great distance by aqueducts, built in a manner which we have often laughed at, but which we have not been able to improve, and perhaps never equalled, in engineering skill and architectural taste. The remains of the Roman aqueducts leave that city to the present day the best supplied with water of any in Europe, although they are but the remnant of twenty or thirty which supplied the old town, nine of which under Frontinus, in the first century, were 255 miles long.

The Mexican aqueducts are not less famous; wooden and clay pipes were both tried there, and in some towns every house had its own supply from the reservoir. The western continent, from Mexico to Chili, seems to have long been famous for its mode of managing water; and being used extensively for irrigation, making the deserts fertile; through parched valleys, and along the sides of the half burnt hills, carefully gathered from streams and wells sunk through the solid rock, it is no wonder that it took a higher position in American society than in most other countries, having divine honours conferred upon it. Modern America is not behind; New York has learnt a good lesson from the Incas and Tezeucans.

As a profuse supply of water is not a novelty, neither is it an unnecessary thing. Mr. Chadwick's Report on the State of the Labouring Population gives abundant proof of the necessary connexion between the supply of water and a sanatory condition of the people; and the mass of information afterwards obtained by the health of towns commission on this subject, and in various ways laid before the public, is sufficient to excite us to immediate action. The effect of these inquiries has been manifest, and while they were in progress were continually showing some good fruit; they have caused many towns to review entirely their sanatory state, and to attend to those physical laws which so long had punished us for our neglect.

In many of our manufacturing towns, we see streets inhabited by workmen receiving good wages, but apparently excessively poor, and people therefore honestly enough will assert that

there is a much greater amount of poverty than the inhabitants of the place know to exist. The cause of this is chiefly the difficulty of procuring the necessary conditions of cleanliness. A stream of water would wash a street in a few minutes, now for months of each year in an unwholesome state; it would wash the outside of the houses which never appear clean; and it would give facilities for the cleaning of everything within, which even in the cottages of respectable workmen have not that sweetness, as it is called, which would result from a scouring with abundance of water. Generally the people of England have no need to be taught cleanliness, and whatever we may say about baths here and on the Continent, in cleanness we fear no rivals, by whatever method that cleanness be obtained. But there is a class which does need teaching—a class that live in streets ill supplied with water, that have lost every instinct, one would almost suppose, that leads their neighbours more fortunately situated to the most scrupulous attention. Neither is it in the courts and alleys where this inattention is worst, for it is worthy of remark, that when a court is exceedingly confined, the attention to cleanness in the inhabitants becomes much greater, probably from the subject pressing so closely upon their attention, that the most careless are compelled to observe it. Those who get water with difficulty, give up all attempts to be clean, in despair. The medical man and chemist may view effects of decomposing vegetable and animal matter as a law by which the state of decay is communicated to the living tissues, and avoid them just as they would avoid a sharp knife or any other mechanical danger; and the milk-maid will avoid everything unclean with even greater care, from instinct taught by long custom, and continually enforced by the fact, that any dish which may have escaped its ablutions takes care to record it by its sourness. To impress this lesson on streets and towns, however, the condition of cleaning must be easily attained, not by those who do not need it, as we too often seem to think, and consequently give water in abundance to those who could get it before, and now pay for a still easier mode, but by those persons who have hitherto been supposed unable to pay. It is the case that this class who do not, or fancy they cannot, pay a water rent, or cannot get a convenient house with water in it, or near it, are in reality obliged to pay enormously for all that they use, from $\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $1d.$ for a can of water, when it has been sufficiently shown that 40 gallons per day may be supplied to them for $1d.$, or at the most $2d.$ per week, given to them at all hours without the cost of carriage, or the expense of cisterns or tubs in which to preserve it. The value of the poorer classes

has not been sufficiently seen, but we are learning that although they cannot subscribe sums sufficient to make gigantic works, they can encourage and support them when made. At present they pay dearly both in time and labour; they must wait long at a stand-pipe when many are to be supplied, and they must carry it far. Every effort at cleanness is a severe labour, and not to be undergone by persons who have worked all day in a factory or elsewhere, nor by those who remain at home, frequently too weak or too young for such exertions. Besides, this virtue in such circumstances almost ceases to be one, or loses all its beauty; it is a vain striving after what is unattainable, and spending their strength in vain. The arrangements of society put little value on a poor man's time, by a fallacy in reasoning, calculating the value of his leisure by the amount which he would have gained if working, instead of calculating the value of his leisure as increased in proportion to its scarcity, and to the amount of toil by which it was procured, the rule applicable to all other values. We may view with pleasure the movement made by government, in the 'Act to encourage the establishment of public baths and washhouses,' but we must not imagine that this is enough, even if we saw it carried out to the utmost, and we hope to show that the question is large enough to leave this part of it as a very inferior one.

The only way of making the use of water as general as it ought to be, is to lead it into every cottage; if there are difficulties in the way of this, the sooner they are combated the better. The only objections, urged are the difficulties of collecting rents, and the injury done to the piping by ill-intentioned persons. The water rent may be paid by the landlord, and the house becomes 1*d.* a week dearer, or it may be 2*d.* The injury done to the pipes must be small; there are few persons who would steal a stop-cock in such circumstances, so much to their own inconvenience, and so easily detected. The abuse of water by allowing it to run, has been mentioned by some persons, but this can only occur when the water is not in a convenient place; no one would make his house uncomfortable by leaving the water constantly running. The spirit of the times is against suspicion, and we can learn to use much, only by having much to use.

Those who are acquainted with the working class must know that a wash-house, however near, cannot compensate for water in the house—a mother washes whilst the baby sleeps, and ceases when it cries. The child must learn to keep itself clean by being accustomed to an abundant use of water from its earliest years, and should not complain, as they have been

known to do, of catching cold by being washed. Such a case tells a long tale of weakness, of defects in the skin and the circulation.

Again, one penny for a bath is small ; but for a family of five, it is fivepence a week, bathing every week, a thing not to be expected ; and even were this attained, it would not much diminish the demand for a regular house supply.

When a town of moderate size is situate on a rapid river, as the Rhine, the Rhone, or the Danube, or in our own island, the town of Perth, the quantity of refuse thrown into it is carried away, and becomes imperceptible in the profuse supply of water. Our towns generally are differently situated. London is annoyed at low water ; the stream is not sufficient to carry off the sewers without offence, and at high water the sewerage is driven up the river. Our manufacturing towns are on very small rivers ; so small in comparison to the towns, that they are converted into mere open sewers. One, of these things, therefore, becomes necessary, either that the streams should be enlarged, or that less refuse should be thrown into them. Both these ends may be attained. There is yet another method, that the rivers should be covered over, as proposed, in the neighbourhood of towns—a method which is far from agreeable to our feelings, far from being natural to hide from our sight an object so beautiful as a river, and so beneficial to health, if kept moderately clean. But the objection to this method, which will have most weight, is, that in some cases it is impossible, in all expensive, and affording no reasonable hope of repaying itself. It may be well for us to look at the state of our rivers, wells, and of the water used generally by us. We have no one to blame for the state of things complained of ; the towns have grown up rapidly, and no one could foresee their destination. Lancashire, and the whole of the north of England, are well supplied with water ; but a very small proportion of the water can, in reality, be put to profitable use, whilst there is a constant demand, and a constant enormous loss. A factory throws its refuse into a stream, and destroys ten times more than it uses. In smaller towns, open drains and unsewered streets saturate the ground with impure waters, so that the wells, however they may be an improvement on the river water, give proof of their partial origin. As most of the smaller streams have factories upon them, the larger ones, such as the Irwell, receive that which has been used, and is not capable of being used for many purposes again. Well water in a large town, unless the well be very deep, and the town kept very clean, can never be found as good as is desirable ; and water from the neighbourhood of the

Medlock and Irwell, from a well twenty feet deep, was found to contain phosphates in greater quantities than could be expected to come from any mineral source: the Medlock or the streets is their most probable origin. It is vain to say that the wells are not complained of; the popular opinion on such subjects is not of any value, as it is a common thing for sensible persons to imagine that it is the *nature* of the water in different places which causes its different qualities, instead of seeing that water must owe these qualities to substances in solution, which substances may be innocent or injurious; and it is common also to prefer water which does not taste well, as being valuable for its medicinal effects, confusing the ideas of nausea and wholesomeness. Another source of impurity in well water touches on a subject which some persons do not like to use as an argument, the state of churchyards in towns. Mr. Chadwick says, in his report on Interment in Towns, that as the wells are polluted by various causes, 'the parties responsible for any one source of injury are apt to challenge, as they may safely do, distinct proof of the separate effect produced by that one. Popular perceptions, as well as chemical analyses, are equally baffled by the combination, and complaints of separate injuries are rarely made.' But complaints are made of separate wells frequently, however difficult it may be to make the subject of sufficient importance for public interest, and the examination of wells near churchyards requires to be made no further than it has been. In some parts of Germany wells are not allowed nearer than 300 feet, as the water may be found impure by the usual tests at a less distance; and if we consider the flow of water on the soil, it will require very little proof, as it must come in contact with everything in its course. If many wells are near each other, they rise and fall together: the soluble matter in the soil must, therefore, flow from the one to the other.

Houses in the country are often supplied with bad water from inattention to this fact; and gentlemen who have fine houses and plenty of land have a well filled with water which is unwholesome, simply because they have it close to the house, or too shallow, or badly built, so that the drainages of a kitchen-garden are not kept out. In a case of this kind, near Manchester, the water was found to contain a great deal of common salt, besides ammonia, and the usual accompanying salts which are found in organized bodies; nor was the well suspected until it occasioned the illness of some of the family; the garden had been manured with salt, thus accounting for the very large quantity found in the water, and pointing clearly to its origin. The cure was effected by coating the sides with good brick and

hydraulic mortar, so as to bring all the water from the bottom of the well, thereby avoiding the direct surface drainage. Another mode of obtaining impure and injurious water, caused by the want of a good supply, is to use the water from the tops of houses. This water, when filtered, appears beautiful, and fit for use; but good water is not to be known by appearance merely; nor even by the taste, although taste is certainly very delicate. The water from houses in Lancashire contains many things in solution, all that the smoke and vapours generally of a manufacturing town are likely to contain, besides the soot of which it smells, and which blackens it, but which filtering removes. This water must always be avoided; but if introduced into lead cisterns, is still more dangerous. The water is often acid, and acts on the lead. Zinc has been recommended as a preserver; but this is not an agreeable metal to drink, and it can only act from its becoming positive and dissolving. More than one case has occurred of bad health from using the filtered rain water of towns. Zinc has been used in water-works, perforated so as to act as a filter, and nailed with copper nails. The water was found to be intolerable, and the disuse of the plan cured it immediately. This is a parallel case to the zinc and lead, as the zinc becomes positive to both lead and copper. Iron would answer the same purpose as zinc, but the taste would be more disagreeable, whilst the water would be more wholesome: another instance of the insufficiency of the senses to detect impurity in water without some aid. In general, water obtained from towns, whether by rain or from wells, is suspicious, is in no case good where the depth is not great. Water from districts highly cultivated is bad, unless care is taken to have it passed through a great depth of soil; and persons coming from large uncultivated tracts, or from a region of great rivers, complain of the almost constant imperfection of the water of cultivated districts and of towns.

We have been endeavouring to show that much bad water is used, that it is scarcely possible by wells to get good water in towns, that there is too little water used, and that the water of rivers and wells is unnecessarily polluted. The water thus spoiled is, however, in the same proportion rendered more valuable, as the Metropolitan Sewage Manure Company sufficiently show. The water containing the refuse of towns contains all the decomposed and semi-decomposed matter from the food used in towns. Inorganic matter, when supplied to the roots of growing plants, is absorbed and combined with organic matter, which the plants form out of the elements of water and substances contained in the atmosphere, along with

the vegetable mould in the soil. Some plants contain more, some less, but all contain four or five per cent. of these inorganic salts, found as ashes when the plant is burnt or used as food. Every town, then, can supply the waste matter, from all the food that is used in it, available for feeding an equivalent quantity of crop. The fact is a simple and undeniable one; and if we throw away this matter, we of course throw away the most valuable raw material for the manufacture of food which can anywhere be found. We complain of the price of food, of the barrenness of land, and the price of manures, and send away more to the sea than even the guano ships can hope to replace.

We have all heard of the famous irrigations at Edinburgh, where land has been made to pay £50 an acre; in many other places also, less known, it has produced extraordinary results. The Duke of Portland used the drainage of Mansfield for land of the poorest possible description, a mere barren sand, it is now worth £14 per acre. It has also been tried, according to the evidence in the Report before us, on farms near London and Glasgow, with results always certain, besides on a smaller scale in many parts of the country, with more or less care and knowledge, and with more or less of an increase of value accordingly. At Bury and some other towns, a small portion of the irregular sewerage of the place has been led over meadows at a trifling expense and labour; an open drain has been cut to the upper part of the field where the situation afforded an incline, and the water flowing over upon the fields, has distinctly marked them out as the richest of the neighbourhood. In many of these cases it is evident that the state of dilution has not been sufficient, and that an approach at least to the very dilute state recommended in the report by the highest authority, is to be recommended. (See Smith of Deanston's evidence, &c.)

The impure water of which we so much complain as a nuisance in our streets and rivers, has this value in it, and it is for us to make the most of this fortunate circumstance. We must bring plenty to our population out of that which is at present valueless, and make an unwholesome state of things wholesome and profitable; and we must have a supply of pure water to wash every remnant of the impure from us. In this way the subjects connect themselves, and it will be found, in all probability, an advantageous thing not to separate them.

The history of many companies, and water companies among the rest, is not what we should like to see over again, and as a considerable change is likely to take place, it is unnecessary to complain much. One plan is made, and laid before the Parlia-

mentary committee; it is opposed by other interests, but the matter does not, in spite of the integrity of the individuals, rest solely on its own merits. How seldom do we find a town which wants water calmly inquire how it is best to be obtained, and at once make a sufficient supply for itself! One plan is tried; if the party does not carry it through, another is tried, not from any neglect of the parties who decide, but because there is not a sufficient number of plans represented; for instance, an act was applied for to supply water for Manchester from Swineshaw and neighbourhood; it was opposed, on the grounds that there was not enough for the town and the factories also, but it seemed to be of little consequence whether any other place could be got, or whether it was not the most natural place to which to look. Surely, if the latter were the case, it is of more consequence that Manchester and its environs should be well supplied, than that a few factories in the country should be profusely supplied. Another attempt was made to bring it from Bolton, certainly without considering natural aptitudes; and now a southern source is contemplated, simply because driven from their first positions. To judge of the matter, all these schemes ought to be placed before a committee at once, and the best chosen, simply because it is best.

We often see that large towns make small water-works, and eke out their supplies in an awkward manner; if it should be necessary to begin on a small scale, it is of the greatest consequence that the supply should be from a district which contains means of increasing it. It is expensive and inconvenient to bring water from all points of the compass.

As the cleansing of towns naturally leads us to the use of the refuse as a manure, it would be well to look at these subjects together. Mr. Chadwick says, in his evidence—

‘I may state as one of the most important conclusions which my investigations established, that the cesspool, apart from its offensiveness and its noxious effects in the pollution of air and springs, is really an expensive arrangement; and that even the expensive machinery of the water-closet, including the fair supply of water, is for the poorer class of houses a cheaper arrangement. The necessity of the application of water for this purpose, and of the adaptation of the water with the soil pipes, the drains, and the sewers, formed the chief ground for the conclusion now admitted, of the necessity of uniting under one and the same management, as part of the same set of works, the works for water supply and drainage.’ (Metrop. Sew. Man. Rep. p. 110.)

This, then, is another reason why a water company should pause to consider what amount of water may be required, and

what else may be done with it when it has passed through the town; we bring it in, we do not lead it out, but pollute some miles of a stream with it. At present, there is a great deal of refuse carried out; it is an unpleasant custom, and Mr. Chadwick has abundantly proved it to be unprofitable. If a town be well washed, according to the plan proposed by him, and the London company also, the refuse matter must be in a very dilute state, and must therefore be applied to a large extent of ground. Mr. Smith, of Deanston, has shown that water is the cheapest vehicle; and an experiment is mentioned by Mr. Chadwick which gave four and five-fold crops, with liquid manures, and only one and a half with the same amount applied in a solid state. Mr. Stuart states also in his evidence, that it can be supplied at 2d. per ton, to the fields about London.

To do this requires, of course, a great deal of water, but we must remember that the water has been already used in the town, and requires only its channel from the town to be changed. The quantity proposed to be put on an acre by the London company is 500 tons per annum; probably this may seem a great quantity in a moist climate like ours, but let us hear Loudon, as an authority: 'Water appears to act as a stimulus, as a medium for conveying food, as a consolidation of mossy soils, as a destroyer of some descriptions of weeds and useless plants, as the cause of warmth at one season, and refreshing coolness at another. From these circumstances, and also from what we observe in nature, there appears to be no soil, or situation, or any climate in which watering of grass lands may not be of service, since the banks of streams between mountains of every description, and in every temperature, from that of Lapland to the equator, are found to produce the richest grass. One circumstance alone seems common to all these situations, that the land must be drained either naturally or only by art. The flat surfaces on every brook or river, after being covered by water or during floods, are speedily dried, when they subside by the retiring of the waters to their channels. Smith, an experienced irrigator, supposes that there are few soils to which irrigation may not be applied with benefit; his experience has determined that the wettest land may be greatly improved by it, and also it is equally beneficial to those which are dry.' Winter, and not summer, is the general time for irrigating land, so that it appears rain is not sufficient, and is in its action entirely distinct from irrigation. Sir H. Davy says of irrigation—'Water which has flowed over a calcareous soil is beneficial, being impregnated with carbonate of lime; common water also generally contains also a certain portion of

‘organizable matter, and which exists in larger quantity when the stream runs in a cultivated country.’ In another place, he says, ‘The waters which breed the best fish are the best fitted for watering meadows, but the benefits of irrigation may be derived from any kind of water.’

By organizable matter, he no doubt means organic matter, and such inorganic matter as can be taken up by organic structures. The quantity of organic matter taken down from the higher lands by rivers is immense; nor is it possible to find water which comes under the description of ‘any kind,’ which is meant to signify water which may have nothing in solution. Some of our most beautiful streams which arise from hard siliceous rocks, and travel over a barren country, and are universally considered as being of the very first quality for drinking, do really contain a considerable quantity of organic and organizable matter.

We should require no other proof of the matter than this, that fishes live in them in great abundance, and that water which has sufficient material to feed them, must also have matter useful for irrigation. No doubt, in this is to be found the reason why the best irrigating water produces the best fishes. Some of these mountain streams contain in every million gallons, forty pounds of organic matter, which is in combination with a certain amount of inorganic matter, five or six per cent. generally, composed of the usual salts which are yielded by the ashes of plants, and in a state peculiarly fitted for feeding other plants. Probably none of them are without silica, even such as flow over the hardest gritstone of Lancashire and Yorkshire, or the slates and other close grained formations of the north of Wales; they have a portion which the chemist can easily detect, but the plant can do it with much greater ease. The muddy streams of more cultivated districts and more finely divided soils, contain much more matter, but when we come to a stream which receives the refuse of a large town, the immense increase of organic matter is easily seen without experimental observation.

Dr. W. A. Miller’s evidence shows that there are seven and a quarter grains of ammonia in a gallon of the water from the London sewers. Also, ‘the quantity of potash which passes out of this sewer (Scholar’s pond) per day would be about a ton weight, and the same quantity of phosphates of the earth pass off every day—that is, about a ton of phosphoric acid, in combination with lime and magnesia, emptied from this sewer, every day, in waste, with nearly two tons of ammonia.’ This is only one of the sewers of London. Mr. Brande and Mr. Cooper give similar evidence as to the sewers of Mansfield and Edinburgh.

It will be clear from these facts that water from towns must be of the greatest advantage to land, if even a pure trout-stream is of so much value, according to a high authority. If, again, we take the streams of the manufacturing districts, we have much higher figures, the materials used in these places contribute many materials for the ashes of the plants. Potash and soda, muriatic and sulphuric acids, lime and magnesia, with phosphoric acid, and all the soluble matter used by printers and bleachers. There are many salts; such as lead, copper, and tin, used by such manufacturers; but those who are acquainted with the processes, must know that these are the very substances which are carefully retained. And these, even if in the water, would be rapidly precipitated by the lime and other alkalis. At any rate, the quantity found in the water is scarcely sufficient for distinct measurement. An analysis of the Medlock, taken from a report on the improvement of the town of Manchester, is given here by Dr. Robert Smith, of that town. We are not aware of any prior analysis with which it may be compared.

On October 2nd, 1845, there was flowing down the Medlock, water containing the following amount of salts in solution and suspension, at the rate of—

Potash	3,200 tons per annum.
Soda	4,640 "
Lime	16,900 "
Magnesia	160 "
Phosphoric acid	1,280 "
Silica in solution, in minute suspension	4,800 "
Alumina	320 "
Oxide of iron	2,240 "
Sulphuric acid	8,000 "
Chlorine	2,720 "
Organic matter	1,440 "
Insoluble matter, chiefly silica alumina and iron	33,600 "

The river not being large, it is probable that in dry seasons the solution would be too concentrated for land. The river Irwell is larger, and must, no doubt, contain the same substances in a greater quantity, although in less proportions.

These, then, are the sources of the materials for irrigating land, and we must now say a word about the mode of applying them. To put five hundred tons of water on an acre of land, is not to give it more than five inches of water; but with good draining, this can do no mischief. If we consider the way in

which nature feeds plants, we find that it is with the weakest solutions; the carbonic acid formed in the soil, is the result of a slow oxidation of carbon, a process extending the decomposition of plants over months and sometimes years. The other and chief source of the carbon is the atmosphere, which contains only one-tenth of a per cent. of carbonic acid, in its turn again containing only twenty-seven per cent. of solid carbon. The hardest woods and plants, which contain most ashes, will rise from soil the water flowing over which does not contain three grains of inorganic matter per gallon, of which not a per cent. is silica. And a very small quantity is given to the plant, as the quantity which runs down to the sea through fields and into rivers is very great.

We have heard it objected to good drainage, and by no less a person than Liebig, that it robs the land of the food of plants. To a certain extent this must be the case, because no water from any field will pass off without dissolving something. This quantity, however great in the whole, bears but a trifling proportion to the sewage water. It is probable, that the carbonaceous matter of the soil acts like a filter of charcoal, as the fields give out little organic matter. At all events, this distribution of liquid manure will approach more to the constant and not too profuse supply, which nature gives, and if the drains carry away a portion, it must be a smaller portion than what is carried away now, where the whole year's manure is laid on at once in lumps. It is probable, also, that frequent watering and drainage tends to feed the plants, not so much by removing deleterious matter, as simply by causing a stream of dissolved food to pass by their roots.

It is somewhat remarkable, that water companies hitherto have taken so little care to ascertain whether the water they introduce be good or bad. It is true we are confined to the water near us, but companies have been known to take the water from the river below the town, instead of above, so little has this subject been generally reflected on. In many parts no water can be got without a great deal of lime, and theories have been got up to prove the value of having lime in water; without settling this question, it may be opposed by contrary theories, quite as well supported and more reasonable, that lime is a dangerous and troublesome element in water, and, although not destructive to the health of the healthy, not without danger to those predisposed to disease, if present in great abundance. But allowing the good and the evil to be equally balanced, it is more desirable that we should drink water limed, when we think it will suit us as a medicine, than to drink it constantly.

Water with lime cooks very badly in proportion to the lime; it is injurious to kettles, and steam boilers, causing a loss of coal, and endangering the boiler, besides causing much inconvenience and expense. It is expensive, also, to soap-boilers, causing them to lose a quantity of their tallow.

A mode has been recommended of adding muriate of ammonia to boilers, causing carbonate of ammonia to escape, and leaving the very soluble chloride of calcium in the water, and preventing the formation of the insoluble carbonate of lime. But it must be remembered that this, though of great advantage in the chalk districts of England, cannot be used where sulphate of lime is the chief ingredient in the water, as in Lancashire. Sulphate of lime cannot be decomposed in this manner, because the sulphate of ammonia does not evaporate like the carbonate. Hardness is the most usual fault of water, and we find companies recommending the introduction of water having twenty grains per gallon in it of lime. This happened at Bristol; and at New-castle, the water had little less, besides carbonate of soda three grains, so that the inhabitants were to enjoy a mixture of soda and carrara water for life at a small expense. If nature gives no better, it must be taken, but care must be used to find the best. The general custom is to prove its qualities after it has been determined on.

Probably, no counties in England have equal facilities for obtaining good water with the northern. Cheshire has the Dee, containing beautiful water down to Llangollen, and although it becomes deteriorated a few miles below this spot, passing through a coal county and into the red sandstone, it is still to be considered good, down to Chester. Lancashire and some parts of Yorkshire are near great hills of grit, from which the most beautiful water flows in quantities sufficient, at times, to inundate the lower land. The hills on the north of Derbyshire and northwards are drained on one side into Lancashire; they all give good water. That which is farthest south and west is the hardest, although only half the hardness of the best London water or of that which is used at Manchester and Liverpool. Going north, the water is purer where the rock is more purely siliceous. From Chapel-en-le-Frith to Todmorden are many square miles of land, the use of which is simply to collect water, as far as we can tell; at least, it is difficult to find another value for it. The streams are scattered a good deal, and this is found to be advantageous to manufacturers, who can obtain one, or a large share of one, for themselves; but the question may fairly be put—Can he use all, or does he not use much less, than he wastes? He depends on the constant flow of the water. If a

few were united, a large stream might be formed, factories supplied with no more than they wanted from it, and the rest, instead of being made useless for those who are lower down, might be kept pure all along its course until it is exhausted. The Romans had reservoirs along their aqueducts to irrigate the land on the way to the city. The same might be done now. The Mersey, the Irwell, the Medlock, &c., make a large body of water, more than the boilers of Lancashire ever make use of. Near the source of these streams, the land is of no great value, and the distance cannot be called great—from twelve to fifteen miles at the utmost—an advantage to be found in few places, and half only of the New York aqueduct.

Manchester must have a large supply, and must provide for a still larger. Some of the works in the town use half a million of gallons daily. Some of these supply themselves by wells, which they have dug at a great expense; but it is by no means certain that all could be supplied in this manner, and most of them would more willingly pay for a sure supply from a company, than encounter the risk of failure by boring. Water which comes from the red sandstone is apt to contain a good deal of matter in solution.

Near Bolton and Turton are other sources of water which contains very little inorganic matter; but the hills are not very elevated, and the cultivation is considerable. The water has also a very short flow, and has not time to lose its brown peat colour before it reaches the reservoirs. It by no means equals the water in the east of Lancashire in extent or properties. It is certainly very good for washing, being soft. As some of the land is cultivated to a considerable height, it must be less desirable than Blackstone Edge, Swineshaw, or Kinderscaw, which can never be profitable for corn growing. On low peat districts the streams are often of a coffee colour; streams from higher hills in the Glossop valley—for example, to Woodhead—are beautifully clear, having little matter, organic or inorganic. Probably this is on account of the difference in the state of drainage; but the fact is to be observed as a fact simply affecting the water on the Lancashire elevations in a decided manner.

On almost every side, then, there appears to be water around Manchester; and the whole country seemed so profusely supplied, that the towns had no idea of looking forward to a day of want. An aqueduct is not so expensive as a railway, or at least not more so, and the expense of working is not great. Water is a primary want, and society will be glad to pay for it. The want is now often severely felt by those who can least cause their complaints to be heard; but if a few towns were abundantly sup-

plied, the want would be *more* severely felt in others. We scarcely know the inconveniences we suffer, or rather the conveniences we are losing. We carry water about the streets in carts, when with taps the same work could be better and more cheaply done. We carry it in buckets to dash against the windows by the most expensive of all machinery—the human hand; when the same could be done by a water-pipe, and some better work left for the hand to perform. We make lead cisterns to contain water, because the water from companies' pipes is often given only at stated hours in a week, and we drink a poison which we ourselves manufacture. There are places at Lancashire where persons wait till after midnight for the clearing of the streams, in order to get a bucket of good water. We lose, yearly, thousands in a most unsatisfactory manner, by having warehouses burnt, instead of having a water-pipe on every floor. Insurance companies are excellent contrivances to let the loss be felt as little as possible, but a fire is a loss to the country, and a benefit to no one.

Liverpool is another of the large towns of Lancashire which ought to be better supplied; is worse supplied than most large towns, and stands in need of an unusually large supply. When we look at the great line of warehouses, so striking to one sailing up the Mersey, with anything of a fireman's eye, we may well ask how, if one takes fire, is it to be extinguished, and how are the others to be preserved. A large quantity is wanted to extinguish one, they are all so large; a great pressure is wanted because they are high, and a constant quantity to be ready at all times, because fires are so frequent. Probably no place would pay a better interest on capital laid out on water-works, but the difficulty seems to be to get the water. When we consider the number of towns east of it, and the number of factories, it does not seem advisable to expect it from the Lancashire and Yorkshire hills. Perhaps the nearest source is that proposed for Manchester—the neighbourhood of Turton; but a great town like Liverpool would feel itself more independent if the plan proposed by Mr. Rawlinson were adopted. His proposal is to bring it from the Dee, from the neighbourhood of Llangollen. The distance is great, and the sum required is considerable, but neither are sufficient objections if no better can be found. Water from the Dee is equal to any that can be obtained. The mode Mr. Rawlinson proposes is a novel one. Instead of a heavy aqueduct of the Roman stamp, or such as is used at New York, still heavier and more expensive, being arched for above thirty miles, he proposes a light iron trough, about three feet deep and wide, gradually inclining towards the supply reservoir. Some have objected to the use of iron when water must travel very far; but

if anything will prevent the taste of iron, it is a little carbonate of lime, which the Dee has in solution. Common salt is found in small quantities only. This is the great agent in destroying iron, if not well protected; it dissolves, or rather oxidizes it, until nothing is left but the carbon with which the iron was originally combined. This carbon keeps the same shape, but is so soft that the fingers can break it into powder; the iron, which is ninety-five per cent. of the weight, is entirely gone. But without going into this subject, we may say that this will make a cheap conveyance for water; and that the source, however distant, is by no means extravagantly so, as many persons accustomed to our meagre and unpleasant supplies of water are too apt to suppose.

To exhaust this subject would not be easy. We must, for that purpose, enter into all the details of life; but enough has been said to show that water is as important in every branch of social life, as it undoubtedly is in all other life a necessary element in everything that lives and moves. It would be a pity if our towns would look upon it as a mere convenience for washing or for filling boilers. The importance of it extends from our most temporal to our most spiritual acts; and although we do not expect to see every man virtuous who has a water-pipe in his house, we expect that virtue will flow through it to many houses. We expect that good habits will be made more common, and that it will help in many, although indirect ways in bringing up a race of men physically and morally healthful, instead of a diminishing race addicted to habits of intemperance. We have been accustomed to look for national character in the state of countries as to climate and products, conformation of hill and dale, fertility or barrenness; and the same effects, which we may term æsthetic, must be produced on the mind by the state of towns, as they are clean or dirty, well built or ill built. We know that a fine view will restore vigour to an exhausted mind, that some towns, streets, or houses are cheerful, others gloomy; let us then for a moment picture to ourselves, with the hope of soon forgetting, the lifelong action of a gloomy street upon a whole generation of persons.

This branch of the question is one deserving of more attention than it has received—one depending on the finer feelings of the mind, for which we have not been accustomed to legislate, but as sure in their effects as the more palpable acts of the hands. We hope that the industry of the country will carry out these things with a fulness at least equal to what we have spoken of or hinted at, as we are learning to legislate not so much according to the wishes of men, but according to the laws of nature, the true theocracy to be reasonably aimed at.

- ART. VIII. (1.) *Education Inquiry. Abstract of the Answers and Returns made pursuant to an Address of the House of Commons, dated May, 1833.* Three vols., folio, pp. 1350.
- (2.) *Reports of the Manchester Statistical Society.*
- (3.) *Minutes of the Committee of Council.* 1841, 1844, 1845.
- (4.) *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories.* 1845.
- (5.) *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's.* By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.
- (6.) *Some Remarks on Dr. Hook's Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's.* By one of the Clergy of the Manufacturing District and parish of Manchester.
- (7.) *Report of an Educational Tour in Germany, and parts of Great Britain and Ireland, being part of the Seventh Annual Report of Horace Mann, Esq., Secretary of the Board of Education.* Mass. U. S., 1844. *With a Preface and Notes,* by W. B. HODGSON. 12mo. pp. 272. 1846.
- (8.) *Equity without Compromise, or Hints for the Construction of a Just System of Education, (Second Edition,) with Remarks on Dr. Hook's Pamphlet, and the Letters of Edward Baines, Esq., to Lord John Russell.* By EDWARD SWAINE, Member of the Congregational Board of Education. 8vo. pp. 60. London.

In our last number, we stated that we should be observant of the indications of the public feeling on the question of Popular Education, and we promised to resume the discussion of that subject at greater length in our next. In the present article we shall endeavour to redeem that pledge.

Strong opinions have been expressed by some portions of the Nonconformist press against the admission of any sort of agency from the government in aid of the education of the people. We can respect the motives of the persons who have taken this ground. They regard the course which they have chosen as that marked out to them by an enlightened patriotism, and by religious consistency. We think them in the main mistaken. We wish to show candidly and dispassionately our reason for this judgment. We have no anxiety to make out a case—no solicitude for mere party triumph. The subject is much too grave to be approached with any such view. Our aim, on all sides, should certainly be—to discover the truth and the real wisdom of this matter.

But while this is a topic on which narrow and party feeling should be put into special abeyance, it is not to be concealed that it is here especially that we find ourselves beset with mischief

in such forms. The friends of what is called 'national education,' have done much harm to their cause by their extravagant praises of the continental systems. In some of its departments, the educational apparatus of our neighbours presents much—very much that we should do well to imitate; but those who praise it, or dispraise it, in very passionate terms, are equally objects of our suspicion. It is no longer safe for travellers to indulge in exaggeration. Many people travel now-a-days, and to speak the truth, even of foreign countries, has become necessary to every man who would speak with effect. We once believed things on the authority of Mr. Laing which we have seen good reason to believe no longer; but the re-action of abused confidence has not led us to place ourselves under guidance as little to be trusted in an opposite direction. This, however, has been the course of not a few of late. The continental systems have not been found to contain all the good that was reported of them; and many from this cause have learnt to denounce them as destitute of all good—as, in fact, the grand instrument by which wily statesmen are endeavouring to destroy the last vestige of the world's freedom, and of the world's piety! In like manner, what has been done among ourselves in the cause of primary instruction, by the popular agency, as distinguished from state-agency, has been sometimes unduly lauded; and when the results of the scrutiny which this high praise has provoked have not been such as to give it confirmation, the tendency has been to treat the whole representation as little better than a pious fraud. On the other hand, our government inspectors of schools have drawn pictures of the state of popular ignorance in some districts, which have been just as much questioned, and with many, every such functionary has come to be a person who should be put into the class of mendacious hirelings. Then, there is the Irish Education Board, in which some very ingenious theorists see a machine constructed to do all sorts of bad things, while, in the judgment of others, that Board is the one good thing which England has conferred on that unhappy country. Religious men who insist on their religious peculiarities being mixed up with education, are denounced as sectarians; while the men who plead for popular instruction without any such admixture, are, with kindred courtesy and candour, denounced as atheists! It may seem to demand some stiffness of nerve to commit oneself to any share in a controversy so conditioned; and truly, were we to consult our own ease and quiet we should give our space to other topics. But we think we have a showing of this case to put forth which may serve to correct some erroneous impressions in relation to it.

Confident we are, that much impression of this nature is existing, and that it is disposing those who are under its influence to a course of action which is perilous in a degree they little suspect. Of the real intentions of the government on this question we have no knowledge. On this point the public prints have been our only instructors. It may be that her majesty's ministers, strong in this respect in the suffrages of the legislature, will attempt some scheme of such extent and texture as would be fatal to our existing educational machinery, and adapted to do more harm than good. Should it be so, we shall be among the first to protest against such a project, and the little it may be within our power to do to frustrate it will be done. On this subject our great care is not about parties or sects. Our concern is for the nation—our wish is to aid in the enlightenment and elevation of our common country.

The main points of inquiry demanding our attention seem to be the following:—

I. To what extent are the people of this country brought under school instruction?

II. What is the value of the teaching which the school-going portion of the community are receiving?

III. If there be a deficiency of the means of education, either in respect to its quantity or quality, in what manner may that deficiency be best supplied?

I. Our first inquiry, then, has respect to *the extent in which the people of this country are brought under school instruction*:—

In May, 1833, it was ordered in the House of Commons that a humble address should be presented to his Majesty, praying that he would please to direct that there should be laid before the House—

‘ A return of the number of schools in each town, parish, chapelry, or extra-parochial place; which return, after stating the amount of the population of the said town or place, according to the last census, shall specify—1. Whether the said schools are infant, daily, or sunday schools. 2. Whether they are confined, either nominally or virtually, to the use of children of the established church, or of any other religious denomination. 3. Whether they are endowed or unendowed. 4. By what funds they are supported, if unendowed, whether by payments from the scholars, or otherwise. 5. The numbers and sexes of the scholars in each school. 6. The age at which the children generally enter, and at which they generally quit school. 7. The salaries and other emoluments allowed to the masters or mistresses in each

school, and shall also distinguish: 8. Those schools which have been established, or revived since 1818; and, 9. Those schools to which a lending library is attached.'

In pursuance of this Address a commission was issued in the following August, and the result was, the three folio volumes so frequently cited of late as Lord Kerry's Report. This document is no longer a document to be purchased, and it is to be regretted that those who have relied so much on its authority did not, in citing it, so explain its nature, as at once to have enabled their readers to form a just notion of its contents. Figures may be so selected from it as to seem to present a most extraordinary case, either in favour of the state of popular education in this country, or as exhibiting it in a light the most unfavourable. Along with the figures we adduce from this source, we shall endeavour to present such other information as may be necessary to prevent the mere figures from leading us into error on the one side or the other. Hitherto, the public have only a very imperfect conception of the nature of this document. The instructions given to the inspectors are set forth in the following terms:—

'His Majesty having given directions to His Secretary of State for the Home Department,' says Lord Melbourne, 'to use his best endeavour to obtain satisfactory answers to the above questions, Lord Viscount Melbourne hereby requests the overseers or overseer of the poor of every parish or place in England and Wales, to answer the said questions (in so far as they are applicable to each parish or place), in the manner pointed out on the following pages of this sheet;—or, in case there should be no School whatever in the parish or place, to return this sheet forthwith, with an answer to that effect, signed by such overseers or overseer; but if there be any School or Schools, the particulars of which are known to them or him, to insert answers to the questions applicable to such Schools; or if there be Schools, the particulars of which are unknown to them or him, to send a printed copy of the address (herewith enclosed) to each school-master or schoolmistress in turn, requesting written information from them severally; and, in any case, the overseers or overseer will return such answers, or their own answer or answers (as the case may be), with this sheet; on the outside of which a proper direction is printed for duly returning it to the Home Office.'—p. 1.

The returns for each county throughout England and Wales, were obtained according to these instructions, and the following is the summary page which embraces the general result:—

SUMMARY OF EDUCATION RETURNS, ENGLAND & WALES, 1833.

The Resident Population of England and Wales in the year 1831, amounted to 13,897,187, which number, at the usual rate of increase (one and a half per cent. per annum) must have become 14,400,000 when the Education Inquiry was made and answered. At that time the children under instruction at infant and other daily schools (being 1,275,947) were nearly nine per cent., and the children who attended Sunday schools (being 1,548,890) were nearly eleven per cent. of the above population: the proportion of children from five to fifteen years of age being twenty-four per cent. of the entire population, as was ascertained by enumeration in the year 1821.

1.	INFANT SCHOOLS	2,955	
	In which are children	{	Males	29,543	
	from two to seven		Females	31,069	
	years of age		Sex not specified	28,393	
	Total number of children in infant schools	...					89,005
2.	DAILY SCHOOLS	35,986	
	In which are children	{	Males	549,729	
	from four to four-		Females	434,810	
	teen years of age		Sex not specified	203,403	
	Total number of children in daily schools	...					1,187,942
	Total number of children under daily instruction	...					1,276,947
3.	SUNDAY SCHOOLS...	16,828	
	In which are children	{	Males	634,638	
	and adults		Females	637,101	
			Sex not specified	277,151	
	Total number of children and adults in Sunday schools	...					1,548,890

4. MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOLS :	INFANT SCHOOLS.		DAILY SCHOOLS.		SUNDAY SCHOOLS.	
	Schools.	Scholars.	Schools.	Scholars.	Schools.	Scholars.
By endowment ...	30	1,450	4,076	152,314	571	39,533
By subscription ...	197	13,081	2,632	165,436	15,244	1,423,377
By payments from scholars ...	2,350	40,721	26,791	691,728	101	5,718
By subscription and payment from scholars (combined) ...	408	33,753	2,487	178,464	912	80,262
TOTALS ...	2,985	89,005	35,986	1,187,942	16,828	1,548,890

5. RELIGIOUS DISTINCTION:	Schools.		Scholars.	
Schools established by dissenters in England and Wales.	Infant schools	...	58	4,535
	Daily schools	...	867	47,287
	Sunday schools	...	6,247	750,107
				51,822

6. Schools established since the year 1818—or, more properly speaking—the increase of schools since the year 1818	INFANT & DAILY		SUNDAY	
	Schools.	Scholars.	Schools.	Scholars.
	19,645	671,243	11,285	1,123,397

Lending Libraries of Books attached to Schools in England and Wales, are 2,464.

In this summary there are several points deserving observation. It will be seen that the number of scholars in infant schools, consisting of children between the ages of two and seven years, did not amount to one thirteenth of the whole number attending day schools; and it will assist our calculations if we pass over these schools—in which assuredly very little deserving the name of education can be supposed to have been more than very rarely secured—and if we restrict our attention to such schools as are commonly understood by the term day schools. In these proper day schools, then, it appears, the scholars in 1833 were in round numbers 1,200,000. Now, the population of England and Wales at that time is given as 14,400,000. The proportion of that population of the ages between four and fourteen years would be one-fourth of the whole—that is, would be 3,600,000. Of this number 1,200,000 is one-third. The result is, that of the children in England and Wales, in 1833, between the ages of four and fourteen, only one in three was found attending a day school. Statists are agreed in regarding the persons between the ages of four and fourteen, or between five and fifteen, as being nearly one-fourth of a whole population; and they are nearly as well agreed in regarding that interval as the space which, in a healthy condition of society, should be given to education. The ground on which this space is abridged—abridged to the extent of one-half in some calculations; and the degree in which the children who are not found receiving daily instruction at one time, may be reckoned as not receiving such instruction at any time—these are questions which we shall have to examine presently. But just now, we shall confine our attention to the portion of the population between four and fourteen, and to the question—In what extent were this portion of the population found either in Day Schools or in Sunday Schools. Taking this Report of Lord Kerry as our guide, we see our conclusion—*the proportion of day scholars between these ages is as ONE-THIRD, and the proportion not receiving any DAILY instruction is as TWO-THIRDS.*

But if this be the general representation as to day schools, what is the showing of the same authority as to Sunday schools? It will be seen, that the Sunday scholars are reported as 1,548,890, being considerably less than one-half of the number between the age of five and fifteen. Of this number of Sunday scholars, there is reason to suppose, as we shall presently see, that about one-third should be accounted as Day scholars as well as Sunday scholars—the remaining two-thirds, or a number about equal to the average number of Day scholars, being left to the teaching of the Sunday schools *only*.

Let us now turn to the publications of the Manchester Statistical Society. At a meeting of this Society in 1834, a committee was appointed to examine into the state of the day, Sunday, charity, and infant schools, in the borough of Manchester, and to report on the number of children contained in them, and on the nature of the instruction imparted. The committee were further instructed to direct their attention to the analysis or correction of the returns which had been made for the borough of Manchester, pursuant to a motion by Lord Kerry, in the House of Commons, during the previous session of parliament. Those returns are described as by no means free from error—sometimes overstating the means of instruction and the number of scholars, but more commonly understating them. The result, however, of the inquiry prosecuted by this committee is given as follows:—

‘It appears that the numbers at present attending the different schools in the Borough of Manchester are 43,304 : of whom—

10,108 attend Day and Evening schools *only*.
 10,011 attend *both* Day and Sunday schools.
 23,185 attend Sunday schools *only*.

43,304’

‘The population of the borough being at present probably 200,000, the above number of persons receiving instruction of some kind or other is 21.65 per cent. of the total population. Of those attending Day and Evening schools, the numbers give about 10 per cent.

‘Perhaps the comparative number of those under course of instruction may be more clearly seen in the following statement:—

‘It appears from the inquiry, that there are—

‘About	33,000	scholars on the books of Sunday schools.
‘About	10,000	are returned as attending both Sunday schools, and Day or Evening schools.
Thus	23,000	scholars receive Sunday school instruction <i>only</i> .
‘About	20,000	are returned as Day and Evening scholars.
Thus about	43,000	is the total number of children under course of instruction.
Deducting	10,000	for scholars under five, and above fifteen, which is probably not far from the truth,
‘About	33,000	are left as the number of children between the ages of five and fifteen, under course of instruction. The whole number of children between the ages of five and fifteen, in the borough of Manchester being estimated at 50,000, (or one-fourth of the whole population,) it would thus

appear that about two-thirds of this number are attending school, and that one-third are receiving no instruction in schools whatever.'

Here it is to be observed that of the 50,000 of the population of Manchester, between the ages of five and fifteen, not more than 33,000 are found in *any* school, the Day scholars in this number being less than one-third, more than two-thirds being Sunday scholars *only*, and the remaining 17,000 being reported as receiving no 'instruction in schools whatever.' The same committee published a similar report of the borough of Salford.

'The committee were occupied ten weeks, from the early part of August to the middle of October, in prosecuting this inquiry, and now beg to lay before the society the result of their labours.

'The borough of Salford comprises the township of that name, with those of Broughton and Pendleton; it contained, in 1831, a population of 50,810, and your committee have estimated the number of inhabitants at present, at 55,000. It appeared, by their inquiry, that the numbers attending the various schools in the borough were 12,885 : of whom—

3131	or	5·7	per cent. of the population,	attend Day or Evening
				schools only.
3410	or	6·2	attend both Day and Sunday	schools.
6344	or	11·5	attend Sunday schools	<i>only</i> .

12,885 or 23·4 per cent. of the population.

'Of these, about 2235 were found to be either under five, or above fifteen years of age, leaving about 10,650 as the number of children between the ages of five and fifteen, under course of instruction. The total number of children between these ages, in the borough of Salford, being computed at 13,750, it would thus appear, that 3100 (equal to 22½ per cent. of the whole) are receiving no instruction whatever.

Thus, in Salford, nearly a fourth of the youth between five and fifteen are reported as 'receiving no instruction whatever,' and of the remaining three-fourths, about half were day or evening scholars, and about half were attending 'Sunday schools only.'

The next locality to which this committee directed its praiseworthy labours was the neighbouring town of Bury, of which it supplies the following information :

'The borough of Bury, comprising the township of that name, and a portion of the adjoining township of Elton, contained, in 1831, a population of 17,960 ; which is now estimated at 20,000. The numbers at present attending the different schools in the borough, are 5727 : of whom—

1503 or 7.5 per cent. of the population, attend Day and Evening schools *only*.

1122 or 5.6 . . . attend *both* Day and Evening schools.

3102 or 15.5 . . . attend Sunday schools *only*.

5727 or 28.6

‘Of these 5727 scholars, about 1427 are either under the age of five years, or above that of fifteen. Thus only 4300 children between the ages of five and fifteen are under course of instruction in Bury, out of the total number of 5000 estimated to be between those years, leaving about 700 children who are receiving no instruction whatever.’

Thus, of the 5000 between the ages of five and fifteen who should have been at day schools, there were 1700 not found in any school, and of the remaining number, a minority only attended a day or evening school, the majority being left wholly to the instruction of the Sunday school.

Of the state of education in Liverpool, the same society has published the following summary:—

‘The total population of the new borough would be 230,000, an estimate which is probably not very far from the truth.

‘It appears, first, that the whole number of children, male and female, attending schools of one kind or another, is 33,183, which is about fourteen and two-fifths per cent. of the whole population.

‘Secondly—That of this total number of 33,183, about 6000 are children, either under five or above fifteen years of age, and that, consequently, the number of children between the ages of five and fifteen, attending school, is about 27,200.

‘Now, if 57,500 (or one-fourth of the whole population) be assumed as the total number of children between the ages of five and fifteen in the borough, it would then appear that, of this number, 27,200 are receiving some kind of instruction in schools, and 30,300 (or more than one-half of the whole) attend no schools whatever.

‘Thirdly—It appears that of the total number of children receiving education,

17,815, or about $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. of the population attend Day or Evening schools *only*;

11,649, or about 5 per cent. of the population attend *both* Day and Sunday schools; and

3,719, or about $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the population attend Sunday schools *only*.*

It will be seen, that the day and evening school instruction in Liverpool is in much greater proportion than in Manchester;

* The number of Sunday scholars in Liverpool, between five and fifteen, was 13,882; the number of all ages on the books, 15,363; average attendance, 11,715.

but that of those who attend the Sunday schools, a small fraction only depend wholly on the instruction given in such schools. The number, however, which are described as attending no school of any description is really frightful, being as 30,000, of the ages from five to fifteen, out of 57,000! This, too, it should be remembered, is one of the series of reports by the Manchester Statistical Society, prepared under the impression that justice had not been done to the public spirit of the north, in the cause of education, in the returns made by Lord Kerry's inspectors. The Report, indeed, gives an increase upon the number of scholars returned by Lord Kerry's committee, so very large as to force upon us the suspicion that there has been great inaccuracy somewhere on the favourable side. Still, assuming this favourable account to be correct—mark its result.

The report published by a committee of this society respecting the township of Pendleton, near Manchester, bears date March, 1838. Of that township the committee say,

‘The total number of Day and Evening scholars, and of those reported as receiving regular instruction at home, appears to be 13·7 per cent. of the entire population; and taking the ages between five and fifteen, about *one-half* are found not to be receiving *any daily instruction*.’—p. 7.

The society of whose useful labours we are thus availing ourselves, has published reports of the state of education in York, in the borough of Kingston-upon-Hull, and in the small county of Rutland. These last reports present the most favourable view of elementary instruction published by this society. The population of York in 1836, when this inquiry was made, was estimated at 28,000. Of this number, the proportion between five and fifteen years of age would be 7000, and of this whole number two-thirds were attending Day, Evening, or Sunday schools, and one-third, even in York, were not attending any school whatever. But the proportion attending Sunday schools only was unusually small, being little more than one-fifth of the entire number of school-goers, (pp. 4, 5.) In Hull, something more than one-third of the population, between the ages just mentioned, were not attending day or evening schools; and in the pet county of Rutland, with its parish church to every 400 of the population, it was nearly one-third of the children between those ages who did not attend any day school. Of the remaining two-thirds, the number attending Sunday schools only was much less than the average.*

* Statistical Journal, vol. ii. 303—307.

Thus far we have been aided by Lord Kerry's Report, and by the publications of the Manchester Statistical Society. In 1840, the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel became an inspector of schools in the same district, and in October of the same year gave in his Report to the Committee of Council on Education. This document commences as follows:—

'My Lords,—Having been instructed by your lordships to obtain what information I might be able, on the state of elementary education in Birmingham, and in some of the great towns of Lancashire, I visited Birmingham on Wednesday, July 8, and from that day till September 8, I continued to prosecute my educational inquiries in that town, and in the principal towns of the cotton district. In these two months I visited 195 schools, of which 42 were in Birmingham, 26 in Manchester and Salford, 52 in Liverpool, and the rest in Stockport, Warrington, Hyde, Ashton, Oldham, Rochdale, Bury, Bolton, Wigan, and Preston; 146 of these schools were day schools of various kinds, and 49 were Sunday schools. Having no authority from your lordships to inspect any school officially, I owed my introduction to these schools to the kindness of the patrons, and of the members of school committees, from whom in general I received the greatest civility, and who were in almost every instance ready to facilitate my inquiries.

'In Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Salford, and Bury, my investigations were much assisted by the extensive and minute information which has been furnished in the printed reports of the Manchester and Birmingham statistical societies. Their laborious and systematic examinations had collected an amount of facts which it would have been impossible for me to obtain in the short space of time which I could devote to this object; and both from the statements of various gentlemen with whom I conversed, and from the comparison of numbers reported in their pages to be attending at various schools, with the numbers which I myself counted at those schools on the occasion of my visit to each, I was enabled to judge that their reports were favourable to the existing schools. In two national schools, reported to contain 220 boys and 104 girls, I found 170 boys and 76 girls: in another, where the reported number of children was 190, I found 67: another, said to have 94 girls, mustered on the day of my visit 50, and in several other schools I found the actual numbers inferior to the reported numbers.'

The conclusion of this paragraph is sufficient to show, that the amended returns of the Manchester Statistical Society, as compared with those in Lord Kerry's Report, should be received with caution. We are disposed to think, that could the former returns be fairly tested throughout England and Wales, they would be found to present, upon the whole, a view of the state of popular education fully as favourable as the facts of the case would warrant.

Speaking of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Salford, and Bury, Mr. Noel writes:—

‘The combined population of these towns is above 685,000: assuming, therefore, that in a healthy state of society the children between the ages of five and fifteen ought generally to be at school, about 171,250, or one-fourth ought to be under instruction. But the actual number between these two ages under instruction is only 96,974, so that 74,267 children, between those two ages, are left totally without instruction in those five towns alone.

‘In all the large towns of the cotton districts which I visited, the Sunday schools are well attended, and the dame and common schools are numerous; but all of them, with the exception of Preston, are exceedingly deficient in public day schools.

Ashton-under-Lyne, which had in 1831, 11,720 inhabitants, and has since rapidly increased, has not one public infant or day school (1840); and the chapelry of Oldham, which, in 1831, contained 50,573 inhabitants, has three infant schools, and one endowed school for 100 boys, who are nominated from the parish of Prestwick, and various neighbouring parishes, but has not one elementary day school for the children of the chapelry.

‘The amount, then, of instruction in the cotton district, and especially in the five towns examined by the statistical societies, one-nineteenth part of the population may be found in dame and common schools only; one-fourteenth in Sunday schools only; and about one-twenty-fifth in public elementary day schools of all kinds. Of 122,758 scholars in the five towns, 49,413 are instructed in dame and common schools; 22,290 being in dame schools, 17,123 in common schools; of these numbers 16,244 attend dame schools only, and 19,748 attend common schools only; and on the whole 13,380 attend Sunday schools as well as dame and common schools, while 36,033 attend dame and common schools only.’*

These figures are not so intelligibly given as they might have been; but from Mr. Noel’s tables (pp. 81, 82) it appears that of these 122,758 scholars, 22,290 were in dame schools, and may be reckoned as under five years of age. It follows, then, that of the 171,000 between the ages of five and fifteen in those five towns, 48,008 of *all classes* were found in day schools, 48,966 were found attending Sunday schools *only*, and 74,267—*considerably more than one-third*—were not found in a school of *any* description!†

* Minutes of the Committee of Council of Education. 1840-1. 69, 70.

† In an elaborate statistical return just completed for the city of Glasgow, under the auspices of the Town Council, we find the ‘number of children above six, and under sixteen years, not at school, and *who cannot read*,’ are 9430, out of a population, between those years, of 47,383.

We are ourselves indebted to an intelligent friend, a resident in the town, for a carefully digested return from Great and Little Bolton, in Lancashire. The population of these places in 1841, was 49,763, and, according to the usual rate of in-

Of the towns which have thus far come under our notice, Manchester, Salford, Bury, and Pendleton, may be regarded as a fair sample of our manufacturing towns; Liverpool and Birmingham, of our large towns generally, through the kingdom; and York and Hull may be taken as representing our better class smaller towns. In Liverpool, York, and Hull, the proportion of day school tuition is great, as compared with the numbers receiving only Sunday school instruction; but in Manchester, Salford, Pendleton, and Bury, the numbers found in Sunday schools *only* greatly preponderate.

It should be remembered, too, that the documents we have cited were the result, for the most part, of an impression that a better showing as to the state of elementary education among us than had been hitherto reported might be made; and that they have been lauded accordingly by persons disposed to take that view of the question as eminently valuable and trustworthy. The conclusions, then, to which we come from these authorities—and to which we may come, we presume, without the fear of questioning—are, in substance, such as we have stated—viz., *That the population between the ages of five and fifteen in the larger and lesser towns of England, taken together, the proportion, from ALL CLASSES, found in day schools, at any one time, would be somewhat less than ONE-THIRD; that about an equal number would be found receiving Sunday school instruction ONLY; and that the remaining number, consisting of greatly MORE THAN A THIRD OF THE WHOLE, must be reckoned as not found in ANY school whatever—Day school, Evening school, or Sunday school.*

We must now look to the bearing of these calculations on the numbers given in Lord Kerry's Report as the totals attending Day schools, and the totals attending Sunday schools. It was a great oversight on the part of the originators of that inquiry that care was not taken to distinguish between the Sunday scholars who were also Day scholars, and those who were Sunday scholars *only*. Nothing satisfactory in this way has been attempted by the

crease, must now be near 54,000. Of this total, the number between five and fifteen would be 13,500. The number of day scholars of all ages in Bolton, is 5604—of which number about 1000 are below five, or above fifteen; leaving 4600 day scholars between those ages, out of a total of 13,500. Of the day schools in Bolton, fifteen are described as public schools, the remaining seventy as private schools, about two in five of the scholars being in the private schools. The Sunday schools give an average attendance of 7876 children. On the whole we deem this return from Bolton important, as tending to show the substantial correctness of the reports made by other parties from other towns in Lancashire;—for Bolton, from its wealth, the moderate extent of its population, and the encouragement given to elementary education by its influential residents, may be taken as a somewhat favourable example of what is doing generally in such places. It is about one-third of the number between five and fifteen, who are in day schools; and something more than the usual proportion who are found attending Sunday schools only.

inspectors, and we are left to form our own judgment on this point from other sources. This inquiry is now important, inasmuch as it is clear that the children who attended both day-schools and Sunday schools have been reckoned *twice*, first as Day scholars, and again as Sunday scholars. To arrive at a just conclusion on this point we must refer to reports in which this distinction has been kept in view. In the reports published by the Manchester Statistical Society, and in some others, this distinction has not been overlooked. In Liverpool, accordingly, we find 13,382 reported as the number of Sunday scholars, and of that number, 11,649 were also day scholars. In Salford we find 6541 day scholars, 3410 of whom were also Sunday scholars. In Bury, of 2625 day scholars, 1122 were Sunday scholars. In Pendleton more than half the day scholars were also Sunday scholars. The same was true of York. In Hull the proportion attending Sunday schools *only* was even less than in York, being as 405 in the former place to 842 in the latter. In Manchester, of 33,000 Sunday scholars, little more than 5000 appear to have been also Day scholars. In Bristol, about the same time, of 11,648 Sunday scholars, 4513 were also day scholars.* In Birmingham, also, about a third of the Sunday scholars were also in day schools; somewhat more than half the day scholars being day scholars *only*.†

These facts, taken together, warrant the conclusion, that not less than half the number, given as the total of day scholars in England and Wales, have been reckoned twice, first as day scholars and again as Sunday scholars. This fault attaches, also, to the statistical returns procured by Mr. Baines from the manufacturing districts in 1843, not less than 100,000 children reckoned by him as day scholars, being again reckoned as Sunday scholars. We do not charge Mr. Baines or Lord Kerry's inspectors with intending to produce a false impression, but certainly the tendency of the method they have adopted is to present an *apparent* number of the total of Day and Sunday scholars considerably above the *real* one. The total number for England and Wales in the former view would be 2,726,832; in the latter view only 2,142,842, being a reduction of 583,990. So that, reckoning the total population of the two countries at 14,400,000, and the one-fourth between four and fourteen as 3,600,000, of this latter number *something less than a third were found in DAY schools, considerably less than a third in SUNDAY schools ONLY*, and nearly ONE MILLION AND A HALF IN NO SCHOOL WHATEVER.

But here the question arises—it being clear that the numbers

* Statistical Journal.

† The Physical and Moral Condition of the Children and Young Persons, &c., p. 201.

of the population between the ages of four and fourteen at day schools in 1833 were less than one third—in what degree may the remaining two-thirds be reckoned as receiving day school instruction at some other time, while between those ages, though they were not receiving such instruction at that time? Much depends, in regard to this entire subject, on the answer that may be given to this question. It may be declared to be most unreasonable to expect that the education of the people of this country should extend over an average of ten years. Be it so. Let the space be reduced one-half. This would give twice 1,200,000, instead of once that number; but even, this would leave you *nearly a million and a quarter of souls*, to be thrown upon society *every ten years*, who have never had a place in any day school, the great mass of whom we may be sure cannot even read their mother tongue, and who will take along with them all that unfitness for a right discharge of their social and religious duties which is ever implied in such absence of instruction. We admit that the figures we have cited may be otherwise dealt with, but by no valid method can the case be made to take a more favourable aspect than we have thus given it.

Perhaps the ground of this conviction will be more clear if we endeavour to distinguish a little as to the relative proportions of different classes in the community. According to the census of 1831, the males of twenty years of age and upwards in our agricultural population in England and Wales, were 1,073,912, while the remaining, the non-agricultural portion of the community, of all classes, amounted to 2,318,778.* Of the agriculturists, two in seven only—somewhat less than one-third—are reported as being occupiers of land, and not labourers. The remaining two-thirds and a fraction were labourers. The non-agricultural division embraces a much stronger upper and middle class. Its unemployed persons, capitalists, bankers, professional men, manufacturers, and wholesale and retail traders, &c., must be reckoned as somewhat more than one-third of the whole population; but looking to the country as a whole, we shall be justified in regarding the upper and middle classes as about one-third, and the skilled operatives, and labouring classes as two-thirds. Now the children of the upper and middle classes will not only all be found in schools, excepting only the comparatively small number educated at home, but a large portion of them will be scholars for a full average of ten years. Out of the 3,600,000 capable of receiving instruction in day schools in 1833, these classes alone should have supplied 1,200,000. But we will not suppose that more than half even of this class are scholars for so long a period

* Porter's *Progress of the Nation*, i. c. 3.

as ten years, and we will leave the other half, even of the middle class, to fall under the general average for all the remaining classes. This done, we have 600,000 permanent scholars from the upper and part of the middle class, and we have another 600,000 from part of the middle class and from the operative and labouring class. This latter 600,000 we may regard as being at school only five years, and as being succeeded at the end of that time by another 600,000. But this only gives us 1,800,000 scholars out of the said 3,600,000 reported as eligible for school instruction. It leaves 1,800,000 as the number who receive no day-school instruction. This we feel is too deplorable a case to be admitted. Well, let us say that even five years is too high an average for the young belonging mostly to the humbler classes; and let us divide the ten years into three parts instead of two, fixing the average at three years and four months. This secures daily instruction to 2,200,000. But this leaves us very nearly where the other reckoning left us—viz., with about a million and a quarter of souls discharged upon society every ten years, in the low state of ignorance and helplessness which the total absence of day-school instruction always supposes. That we do not greatly err in this estimate of the comparative numbers from the middle and higher class, and from the operative and lower class, is rendered probable by the fact that it is not more than half the numbers reported as day scholars that are reported also as Sunday scholars; and by the further fact that, according to Lord Kerry's Report, the number of children who defrayed the cost of their own education was nearly double the number of those who were indebted, in whole or in part, to the charity of their neighbours.

If it should be said that even three years and four months is too long an average, we answer that nothing can be gained by fixing on a shorter term. The children of the class under consideration, receive their instruction for the most part between the age of five and ten; and to reduce the term to less than a third of the ten years in the case of such learners, would be a change which could not give the master more scholars without compelling him to leave upon the whole the same amount of ignorance. It is quite true that a large proportion of the children who attend our common and public day schools leave them at the end of twelve months or a little more; and it is just as true, as the consequence, that great numbers leave such schools nearly as ignorant as when they entered them.* It is a remark-

* Dividing the ten years into four apportionments, the average for attendance at a day school would be two years and a half. This would leave little more than half a million wholly without daily instruction, but it would spread through those four spaces much more than another half million, whose attendance, from the shortness

able fact, also, that the numbers who can read in our Sunday schools, seem to be almost restricted to the number reported as being both day scholars and Sunday scholars. Indeed, how can it be otherwise? Who can suppose reading to be learnt by instruction received as one of a class during three or four hours once a week? Sunday schools have another and a higher office. Even Mr. Baines does not report much more than half the children in our Sunday schools as capable of reading the Bible; and if a portion of this incapacity is to be attributed to the extreme youth of the scholars, much of it is to be traced to an absence, entirely or nearly so, of day-school instruction.

It will be perceived that we do not suppose that any great change for the better has taken place since the publication of Lord Kerry's Report. With a population increasing so rapidly, it has required large and augmented effort to prevent things from becoming seriously worse; and some of the reports published by the Manchester Statistical Society, and the report supplied by the Rev. B. W. Noel, are dated considerably subsequent to 1833. We have not done much more of late years, as regards the increase of school attendance, than keep pace with the progress of the population. But if this be the state of the case, the numbers at present thrown upon society every ten years, in a condition of ignorance so extreme as not to be capable of reading the language they speak, is nearer a million and a half than a million and a quarter; while, in the case of the great majority among the children of the humbler classes who do learn to read, so as to retain the power of doing so with advantage, that power is the extent of the attainment made by them at school. And we must be permitted to remind our readers that this is a conclusion to which we are conducted by documents and authorities admitted as being in substance impartial and trustworthy by the persons who are least disposed to take an unfavourable view of our state as a people in this matter. Can it be possible, then, that we should be brought to look on this condition of our affairs without a deep feeling of shame and apprehension; or that we should regard the existing agency as at all likely to overtake and correct an evil of such magnitude? According to this reckoning, it is about every third person in our entire population who would be found in the condition of a person unable to read, while to be barely able to read would be the highest attainment of a large proportion beyond that number.* If this be not a just representa-

of its time, the youth of the children, and the inefficiency of a great part of common and public schools, would of necessity leave them in a state hardly removed from the most absolute ignorance.

* That this may not appear incredible, let it be borne in mind, that the classes described in the census of 1851, as our labouring class, agricultural and non-agricultural, distinct from the operative, middle, and upper classes, were as 1,245,457 to

tion, let its error be exposed, and we will at once abandon it; but if it be, as we are confident it is, a representation quite within the limits of truth, then we hold, that to throw the slightest veil of concealment over such a state of things, would be to do a grave wrong to religion, to patriotism, and to humanity. Come what may, we will ourselves be no parties to any proceeding of that nature.

In confirmation of this view of the present question, we may state that we have been at the pains to ascertain the number of places—parishes, hamlets, &c., in Lord Kerry's Report, which are returned in England and Wales as having *no school of any description*, and the number of those returned as possessing Sunday schools *only*. The number returned as wholly destitute of schools, is 2664; the number returned as possessing Sunday schools, but no day school, was 1042, making a total of 3706 places without a day school of any description. In 1837, the National School Society issued a circular of inquiry, with a view to returns, as to the state of education in England and Wales, and the number of places to which the circulars were addressed was 12,391.*

The Rev. John Allen made his report in February, 1844, as inspector of schools in the counties of Bedford, Cambridge, and Huntingdon. The parishes, in these three counties, described as those in which no schools, or only schools of the very humblest class were in existence, are, in Bedfordshire, sixty-five; in Cambridgeshire, fifty-seven; in Huntingdon, forty-nine; total, 171. But this, it would seem, is not the worst. The inspector writes—

‘The deficiency in the means for the education of the poor of these counties will be still more apparent, when it is added that of the 41 rural parishes in which daily schools were inspected in Bedfordshire, the number in which any reasonable measure of intelligent and really valuable instruction was communicated, cannot, in my judgment, be rated higher than 24, and that consequently the number of parishes practically without daily schools of value for the poor must be raised to 82; and that similarly in Cambridgeshire, the number of rural parishes in which daily schools were inspected, that seemed to me of value, cannot be rated higher than 49; while the numbers of parishes in which no such schools of worth are in existence for the poor, rises to 83; and similarly in Huntingdonshire, the number of rural parishes in which schools of worth were found, must, according to the same rule, be depressed to 26, while the number of deficient parishes rises proportionably to 61.

‘In Cambridgeshire, there are more than 30 parishes joining each 1,883,698—that is, as about two in five to the whole. (Porter's Progress of the Nation, i. 53.) It is especially in connexion with this constantly increasing labouring class, that our popular ignorance is everywhere thickening about us.

* Report, 1837, p. 105.

other (except where they are broken by the line of Sawston, Great Abington,* Linton, Horseheath, Shudy Camp, and Castle Camps) that edge the south and south-eastern limits of the county, sadly deficient in daily schools of value for the poor.

'In Huntingdonshire, north of St. Neots, and west of Graffham, Leighton, and Old Weston, there is a strip of land which, taking in the interlacing corners of Bedfordshire, contains from 14 to 16 parishes, and is without daily schools of worth for the poor. From this district, however, Kimbolton should be exempted, in which there is at present a school for little children, under a mistress, capable of improvement. At Great Staughton, there is an endowment of £18 10s., but the school has been closed temporarily for want of funds; similarly north-west of Steeple Gidding, Sawtry, and Conrington, there are 18 parishes lying together, and forming a corner of the county, without, as I believe, a single teacher trained to the work, or fitted by natural gifts and intelligence to have charge of a school.*

It would be easy to pass from one agricultural county to another, and to multiply descriptions to the above effect to a large extent. In many parishes the zeal of the clergyman suffices to sustain prosperous schools; but in a far greater number they are either wholly wanting, or in a very feeble state. We have ourselves classed a number of rural parishes, including certain rates of population, according to Lord Kerry's Report, for the purpose of ascertaining the proportion of children in day schools in such parishes. Nothing but want of space prevents our giving the result in the form in which we have arrived at it, but it must suffice to say, that our conclusion is, that the numbers as to age which yield one-third as day scholars in cities and towns, do not, on the average, yield more than one-fourth in agricultural districts.

In corroboration of these general views, we quote the following passage from the Report of the British and Foreign School Society, published in 1845:

'Those incessant witnesses against ignorance and neglect, the gaol returns of the kingdom, have again borne fearful testimony to the extent of moral darkness which still broods over large portions of our population.'

'Of the criminals of *Berkshire*, one-third have again been found unable to read; in *Cambridgeshire* and *Staffordshire*, one-half were in this condition; in *Denbighshire*, two-thirds; in *Devon*, out of 71 offenders under sixteen years of age, only four could read well; in *Essex*, one-half were in total ignorance; while of 212 convicted prisoners, 48 had never been at a school at all, 40 had been there less than one month, 45 less than two months, 43 less than four months, and

* Minutes of Committee of Council, ii. pp. 2—5.

only 36 above six months; *Hereford*, out of 385 prisoners, only one could read well; in *Sussex*, out of 877 prisoners, 141 did not know the Saviour's name, 498 just knew his name and no more, 179 had a confused acquaintance with his history, and only 6 per cent. of the whole number had any reasonable knowledge of the Christian faith.'

The conclusion, as to the connexion between ignorance and crime, which these facts suggest is obvious; nor can we regard the substance of these returns as otherwise than trustworthy. We must add, also, one other fact—the Registrar-general of marriages has returned *nearly HALF the people of England of ALL CLASSES as unable to write their names*. Of course, if nearly one half of *all classes* are thus reported, the persons who sign with a mark must nearly all belong to our labouring or operative classes, and must number *more* than one *half* of those classes. It may be true that some females who could manage to write their names, in the excitement immediately subsequent to the marriage ceremony, may prefer the easier process of signing with a mark; but such excuses can only apply to females, and there are motives, we think, which would not fail to dispose the fair sex to avoid giving such a proof of their ignorance at such a time, were it not felt, that to sign with a mark would be less discreditable than an attempt to attach their proper signature. Very many, also, who could write their names could write nothing more.*

The conclusion, then, at which we arrive from all the facts that have passed under our review is—that in England and Wales we have a population, *nearly the HALF of which should be described as unable to WRITE, and about a THIRD of which should be described as unable to READ*. Of the former class, there may be some knowing how to hold a pen, and capable of scrawling letters; of the latter, there may be some knowing their letters, and capable of reading monosyllables; but, we think, that for any useful purpose, and in any honest sense, the non-writing and the non-reading classes in our general population must be reckoned as above.

* We have seen it objected to this fact, that it includes only the marriageable, and not the younger persons who have grown up since greater effort has been made by the friends of education, the effect of which will not become perceptible in this form until some years hence. We are willing to believe that the future may exhibit some improvement in this respect, but we know too much of the present state of our statistics to be very sanguine in our expectations in that particular. It is rumoured, also, that our clergy, in churches where the marriages among the lower classes are numerous, sometimes fill up the names in the register beforehand, leaving nothing but the mark to be attached. This piece of impertinence cannot, we think, for many reasons, be very common, certainly not so common as materially to affect the returns from the whole kingdom. But, as we have intimated, the return of the registrar in this particular is merely corroborative of other evidence.

II. But thus far our inquiry has borne mainly on one point—the numbers, in proportion to the population, attending day schools. We have said little as to the instruction imparted in those schools. It is on the assumption, however, that this instruction is, in great part, of a very inferior description, that we found our judgment as to the low state of education, even in the case of the majority of the young who are counted as educated. We must sustain this judgment by an appeal to facts. The Rev. F. C. Cook, inspector of schools in the Eastern District in 1844, thus writes:—

‘It appears that of 3022 boys examined by me in the metropolitan schools, 1244 are learning letters, or are only able to read easy monosyllables. This class includes none who can read sentences containing words of two syllables, or monosyllables with quiescent letters; 1168 read very simple narratives, the elementary reading-books of the National Society, and Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the simplest portions of the New Testament; 611 read with ease.

‘Of 1872 girls, 723 belong to the first division (learning letters), 728 to the second (reading simple narratives), and 412 to the third. In examining the girls’ schools, I have generally adopted a lower standard for the third division than in the boys’, being satisfied if they read the Bible with ease.’—Minutes of Council, ii. 136, 137.

The Rev. Henry Moseley, M.A. F.R.S., thus reports in the same volume of the schools in the Midland District:—

‘Of the whole 11,782 children, I find that 2449 boys and 1502 girls are able to read, with more or less facility, easy narratives, such as those of the National Society’s central school books, but are not able to read the Scriptures with ease; 1200 boys and 826 girls are able to read the Scriptures with ease; and the knowledge of 5805 does not extend beyond letters and monosyllables. Supposing that 7854 of these children leave school annually, it is therefore probable that not less than 5828 (being 75 per cent.) leave them, none of whom are able to read the Scriptures with tolerable ease and correctness, and more than 1877 (being 24 per cent.) so leave them, knowing only monosyllables and letters.’—p. 503.

‘Out of 13,381 children, I find that 2080, being one in six, read in the Scriptures with tolerable ease and correctness; that 4368, or one in three, are reading easy narratives; and the remainder, being one half, reading letters and monosyllables.

‘I have no certain data for determining the average period during which these children remained at school; from all, however, I have been able to learn, I am disposed to think that it is possibly not more than one year and a half, and that it does not exceed two years. If this be the case, it is certain that a considerable proportion of the children, probably one-half, must leave the schools, and be absorbed

into the labouring community of the country, not able to read.*—
Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1845, p. 150.

The conclusion from these extracts is, that little less than one-third of the children who attend our public schools leave them in a state to be described as *not able to read*. Nor can we conceive of any ground on which the accuracy of these reports should be questioned. They come from *clergymen appointed by the authorities of their own church, to inspect the schools connected with that church*. Disputants who proceed on the principle of denouncing all such witnesses as untrustworthy, are themselves persons not to be reasoned with. What have these persons to gain by underrating the efficiency of *their own institutions*? The natural bias in their case is in the opposite direction.

If, to avoid all ground for exception, we turn from all official persons of this class to the gentlemen constituting the Manchester Statistical Society, the case does not mend. To the intelligence and integrity of these gentlemen Mr. Baines appeals, as to a chief stay of his favourable view of our educational position. Well, the testimony of the Manchester Statistical Society as to the quality and result of our popular education, is not a whit better, upon the whole, than that presented by Messrs. Cook and Moseley. We might cite largely from the Society's publications, especially from their report on Liverpool, in proof of this statement; but in this instance we shall do better perhaps by working second-hand than by handling these authorities for ourselves. We have seen that, in 1840, the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel became a school-inspector. This gentleman studied and tested the reports of the Manchester Statistical Society, and has spoken himself no less explicitly than the members of that society, both as to the quantity and quality of popular education in the Northern Districts. Of the dame and common day schools, in those parts, he thus writes:—

‘The instruction received in dame-schools is represented by the statistical reports to be of the most unsatisfactory kind, in each of the five towns, as may be seen by the following extracts:—

* If the average time of a child's continuance at school be three half-years, one-third of the children must go out every half-year; and if we suppose this change to be made at the end of the half-year, and the third which so goes out to include that sixth part which can read, it must also include a sixth which cannot. Thus as many will go out every half-year who cannot read as who can; or, in other words, half the children leave the school not being able to read the Scriptures with tolerable ease and correctness. Whilst, on the one hand, I have perhaps reckoned the time of a child's continuance at school to be less than it really is; on the other, I have taken the circumstances under which the children leave, more favourably for the efficiency of the school than I am justified in doing. Practically, they are not the best instructed children who leave the first; these stick by the school. The one-third who leave every year do not, therefore, include all the one-sixth who can read.

“ Taking into consideration,” says the Birmingham Report, “ the extreme youth of the children attending these schools, together with the meagre amount of instruction, the total absence of properly qualified teachers, and the general impression which prevails among them, that the children are only sent to be kept out of the way, there will be some danger of over-estimating their value, if they are set down as a whole, as representing much more than nurseries where children of the working-classes are taken care of.”

‘ In Liverpool, “ with few exceptions, the dame-schools are dark and confined; many are damp and dirty; more than one-half of them are used as dwelling, dormitory, and school-room, accommodating, in many cases, families of seven or eight persons. Above forty of them are cellars.”

‘ In Manchester, “ the greater part of them are kept by females, but some by old men, whose only qualification for this employment seems their unfitness for any other. Many of these teachers are engaged at the same time in some other employment, such as shop-keeping, sewing, washing, &c., which renders any regular instruction among their scholars absolutely impossible. Indeed, neither parents nor teachers seem to consider this as the principal object in sending the children to these schools, but generally say that they go there in order to be taken care of and to be out of the way at home.

“ In Salford, as was found to be the case in Manchester and Bury, very little instruction is conveyed; in fact, the younger children appear only to be sent thither in order to relieve the parents from their charges.

“ Very few of these schools were found to possess more than fragments of books, and in many cases no books were to be seen—the mistress not having the means, had she the inclination, to procure them.

“ Order and cleanliness are little regarded, and the children are, for the most part, congregated in close and dirty rooms, in which the whole business of the school is carried on, and where the family sleep. The generality of the teachers are wholly incompetent to their task of instruction; and their ignorance on the most common topics is lamentable.”

‘ The common schools, which are attended by children between the ages of five and fourteen, are represented in the reports to be very little superior to the dame-schools with respect to instruction; and with respect to ventilation to be often worse. The Birmingham report thus speaks of those which are in that town:—“ Ventilation is very little attended to in these schools, and, in some, cleanliness is equally neglected. There is generally a much greater number of children crowded together than in the dame-schools; and the effluvia, arising from the mess of the scholars, mingled with the close air exhausted of its oxygen, and unfit for the purposes of comfortable or healthy respiration, render any long continuance in the school intolerable to a person unaccustomed to it. The systems of instruction adopted are of the most imperfect kind; the general principle of by far the

largest number is that of requiring the child to commit to memory a certain quantity of matter, without any attempt being made to reach the understanding. . . In only twenty-nine out of the whole 177 schools of this class do the teachers profess to interrogate the children on what they read and learn. Eight out of the twenty-nine who do interrogate their children, admit that it is only done occasionally, when time and opportunity permit. As in the dame-schools, corporal punishments form almost the whole of the moral training of these establishments."

'The Manchester schools are described thus:—"In the great majority of these schools, there seems to be a complete want of order and system. The confusion arising from this defect, added to the low qualifications of the master, the number of scholars under the superintendence of one teacher, the irregularity of attendance, the great deficiency of books, and the injudicious plan of instruction, or rather the want of any plan, render them nearly inefficient for any purposes of real instruction."

'According to the reports, the schools of the same class in Liverpool, Salford, and Bury, are very similar to those of Birmingham and Manchester.

'From the answers uniformly made to my inquiries on this subject among persons acquainted with the poor, I judge that the great majority, both of dame and common schools, in the Lancashire towns, answer to these descriptions; and the very few which my time enabled me to visit did not contradict that conclusion. In one of these dame schools I found thirty-one children, from two to seven years of age. The room was a cellar, about ten feet square, and about seven feet high. The only window was less than eighteen inches square, and not made to open. Although it was a warm day, towards the close of August, there was a fire burning; and the door, through which alone any air could be admitted, was shut. Of course, therefore, the room was close and hot; but there was no remedy. The damp, subterraneous walls required, as the old woman assured us, a fire throughout the year. If she opened the door, the children would rush out to light and liberty, while the cold blast rushing in would torment her aged bones with rheumatism. Still further to restrain their vagrant propensities, and to save them from the danger of tumbling into the fire, she had crammed the children as closely as possible into a dark corner at the foot of her bed. Here they sat in the pestiferous obscurity, totally destitute of books, and without light enough to enable them to read, had books been placed in their hands. Six children, indeed, out of the thirty, had brought some twopenny books, but these also, having been made to circulate through sixty little hands, were now so well soiled and tattered as to be rather the memorials of past achievements than the means of leading the children to fresh exertions. The only remaining instruments of instruction possessed by the dame, who lamented her hard lot, to be obliged, at so advanced an age, to tenant a damp cellar, and to raise the means of paying her rent by such scholastic toils, were a glass-

full of sugar-plums near the tattered leaves on the table in the centre of the room, and a cane by her side. Every point in instruction being thus secured by the good old rule of mingling the useful with the sweet.

'Not far from this infant asylum, I entered a common school. It was a room on the ground-floor, up a dark and narrow entry, and about twelve feet square. Here forty-three boys and girls were assembled, of all ages, from five to fourteen. Patches of paper were pasted over the broken panes of the one small window, before which also sat the master, intercepting the few rays of light which would otherwise have crept into the gloom. Although it was in August, the window was closed, and a fire added to the animal heat, which radiated from every part of the crowded chamber. In front of the fire, and as near to it as a joint on the spit, a row of children sat, with their faces towards the master, and their backs to the furnace. By this living screen, the master, though still perspiring copiously, was somewhat sheltered from the intolerable heat. As another measure of relief, amidst the oppression of the steaming atmosphere, he had also laid aside his coat. In this undress he was the better able to wield the three canes, two of which, like the weapons of an old soldier, hung conspicuously on the wall, while the third was on the table, ready for service. When questioned as to the necessity of this triple instrumentality, he assured us that the children were "abrupt and rash in their tempers," that he generally reasoned with them respecting their indiscretions, but that when civility failed, he had recourse to a little severity.

'There was no classification of the children; and the few books in the school were such as some of the parents chose to send. Under such circumstances, the poor man had an arduous task to accomplish; and not knowing what situations might not be in our gift, he informed us that he would gladly avail himself of any opportunity of quitting an employment to which extravagance alone had caused him to descend.

'Schools so conducted can answer few of the purposes of education. They may teach some of the children reading, writing, and arithmetic; while occasionally a favourite scholar, who pays well for it, may learn the elements of grammar, or read a few pages of history. But the mass of the children cannot there learn their duties, nor obtain any useful knowledge, nor become observant or reflective, nor acquire the habit of self-government, nor be prepared to be wise and good men in after-life.

'*Nearly the whole, therefore, of the number attending these schools must be subtracted from the numbers supposed to be receiving sound instruction.*'—pp. 71, 72.

Our next extract describes the state of the National and Lancastrian schools in the same district:

The great majority of the patrons and conductors of the National and Lancastrian schools which I visited, only profess to teach the

children reading, writing, and arithmetic. The knowledge of the English language, natural history, geography, physiology, and the history of their country, are all excluded subjects. Upon none of those could I examine the children generally, because their teachers professed the total ignorance of the children respecting them. If occasionally I heard that Liverpool was an island, that Lancashire was one of the great towns of England, and that Asia and America were chief countries of Europe, I was led to expect this if I heard such grammatical inaccuracies as those contained in the following answers to questions put by me:—"Them as is good goes to heaven"—"The men as was gazing up into heaven"—"He drowned the whole world;" these were mistakes which the teacher did not undertake to correct. But, unhappily, many of the schools were very unsuccessful in teaching what they profess to teach. In several of those which I examined, many children of the highest classes were unable to read fluently, even in the New Testament; words were often mistaken, stops were misplaced, small words were omitted so as to destroy the sense, and many of the children were unable to spell even short and common words occurring in the lesson.

'In some of the girls' schools very few of the children could write, and the writing was very bad; while even in the boys' schools, where more attention is paid to this important art, there were very few boys, and in very few schools, who had attained to a good running hand without the aid of lines. In several of the girls' schools, the children do not learn arithmetic at all. The masters of boys' schools always profess to teach it, but I found the boys sometimes exceedingly defective in their knowledge of even the earliest and simplest rules. In one national school in a large town and a populous neighbourhood, I found only six boys capable of working a short sum in simple multiplication, and five out of the six brought a wrong answer. In another, where 167 were present, I found only twelve who professed to understand compound addition; and when I set these a sum in simple multiplication to work separately, one of the twelve brought a right answer, seven brought wrong answers, two worked it so slowly that they could not finish it, and two could not even begin to work it.

'But it was in their understanding of the Scriptures, daily read, that I regretted to find the most advanced children of the National schools so extremely defective. Not only were they often ignorant of the principal facts recorded in the Bible; but they could not answer even the simplest questions upon the chapters which they had most recently read. Nor was their religious ignorance lessened by their knowledge of the catechism. I several times examined the first class upon a portion of the catechism, and I never once found them to comprehend it. Indeed, to those who consider how they generally read the Scriptures and repeat the catechism, their ignorance appears to be a very natural result. Usually the first class reads one or two chapters of the Bible daily to the master or monitor. In the first case, they would probably have such short questions on what they read as

the general superintendence of the school would allow—in the other, none.

‘It is to the monitors also that the catechism is daily repeated, the class repeating it again and again, till the prescribed half hour is completed.

‘Both in reading the Scriptures to the monitors, and in repeating the catechism, the children showed a marked inattention and weariness, occasionally varied, when the master’s eye was not upon them, by tokens of a roguish merriment. With the very best intentions, those who have adopted the system of the National School Society have, in many cases, admitted into their schools nothing for the elder children except the Bible, and small volumes of extracts from it, and the catechism, and the effects seem to me most unfortunate. All the books on subjects with which children are most familiar being excluded from the school, that thirst for variety which for the wisest purposes has been implanted by the Creator in the minds of children, finding no gratification, their faculties are stunted in their growth, and they sink into an inert listlessness. Nothing can exceed the contrast between the eagerness of the children in a well-taught school and the apathy manifested in most of these national schools. But this is not the worst effect of making the Bible the only class-book. Being thus made the medium through which reading and spelling are taught, it becomes associated in their minds with all the rebukes and punishments to which bad reading, or false spelling, or inattention in class exposes them; and it is well if being thus used for purposes never designed, it do not become *permanently the symbol of all that is irksome and repulsive*.

‘On the *moral and religious* training in these schools I can say very little. *In almost all the schools which I examined on this point, there was scarcely any such thing.*

‘The children would be punished for breaking the school-rules, or if a breach of morality was formally complained of to the master, he would probably punish the child for it; but any direct endeavours to bring the children to be moral and religious, I could scarcely find. When I asked masters what means they employed for these ends, I could find nothing, except the reading of the Scriptures and the repetition of the catechism, in the manner I have before described. But in scarcely any of these schools do the masters address the scholars on the subject of religion, or even read the Scriptures to them. *Very few masters instruct any of the children on religious subjects in the class-room, and scarcely one is in the habit of speaking to the children individually on the necessity of personal religion.* Few visit the parents of the children, or know the children’s character, or take any interest in them after leaving the school. Indeed, that would be nearly impossible. The masters are so frequently changed, either from incapacity, from the lowness of their salary, from their restlessness, or from some other cause, that in most cases it is impossible that any lasting friendship should be formed between them and their scholars.

‘On the whole, I am obliged to report that most of the day schools

which I examined seem to me exceedingly inefficient. The system on which they teach, confining the children to one class of subjects, would render the ablest master inefficient, and reduce the most intelligent scholar to listlessness.

‘The masters, who seem, generally, respectable men, are without assistants, and overwhelmed by the multitude of children whom they have to teach. The monitors, generally boys of ten or eleven years of age, who have only been two or three years in the school, and have little separate instruction, are almost as ignorant as the classes whom they instruct; scarcely know how to read well themselves, and are utterly incapable of exercising the intellect of the children on the lessons which they read. Instead of having a plentiful supply of books on all the subjects most likely to interest them, the elder scholars are generally confined to the Bible for their common school exercise in reading, and are ill supplied even with Bibles. To masters so ill qualified, the school committees afford but small salaries, and the low salaries hinder able men from entering on the profession of school-master, or starve them out of it when they make it their choice.’—pp. 76—78.

It will, we presume, be admitted, that *this* witness is true. Statements of this nature, coming from such persons as the members of the Manchester, Birmingham, and Bristol Statistical Societies, and from the Rev. B. W. Noel, go far to vindicate some other deponents, who have spoken to much the same effect, and who have been not a little aspersed for so speaking. We do not ourselves exercise implicit faith in government inspectors; but to denounce all such functionaries as being wholly unworthy of confidence, is a manner of proceeding as little consonant with justice as with wisdom. To say that all men are liars, is not the surest way to establish our own reputation for veracity. We would also beg our readers to mark the statements of Mr. Noel as to the amount of Bible-teaching which obtains, for the most part, in our day schools, both private and public. It is fair to ask, and is this—is *this* the process and result of that *religious* education for which some of our friends are pleading with so much earnestness—pleading, as though its absence from our day schools must be as a death-knell to our piety as a people? We dare not trust ourselves to express the astonishment we have felt on reading some of the language published on this subject, proceeding, as it does, from men whom we have not been accustomed to regard as imbecile, or as likely to be found ministering to a prejudice which they must know to be a delusion. The British School Society, and, for aught we know, the National School Society likewise, complained of this somewhat ‘dark view’ presented by Mr. Noel; and we can readily suppose that there are both National and Lancastrian schools in a better condition than these descriptions

would suggest ; but what must have been the general state of our day schools so late as 1840, seeing it has called forth such a testimony from such a witness?

But we must bring this section of our inquiry to a close. Here, then, are England and Wales, with their SIXTEEN MILLIONS of people — with *nearly EIGHT MILLIONS unable to write their name*, and with *not less than FIVE MILLIONS unable to read their mother tongue*. This is a startling—an unwelcome statement. It is natural that good men should endeavour to escape from an admission of its truth. To ourselves it is unwelcome. We would not believe it true if we could avoid it. But it is a conclusion which results, not merely from the publications of the Registrar-general, nor from any other solitary testimony, but from evidence emanating from a multitude of points, and all converging upon this issue. We presume, that what our readers want on this subject is **THE TRUTH**. This, we think, we have now laid before them. This being our solemn conviction, the facts before us are so momentous, that we dare not attempt to throw any sort of veil over them. We feel bound rather to give them studied note and prominence. In so doing, we are conscious of acquitting ourselves rightly in relation to our mother-land, to humanity, and to God! We know that in England, more than in any country in Europe, society is the great free-school. Our informal and indirect education is always in process, and is often surprisingly potent. By no deduction of that nature, however, can the general complexion of the picture now presented be materially changed. Nor does it avail us anything to be able to show, that some other states, with the supposed advantage of other appliances, are in a condition in this respect little better than our own. The bad estate of our neighbours is no sufficient reason for our contentment under the evils which press upon ourselves. Here the evil is, and, unless brought under some new and much more powerful influence, bids fair to grow upon us until it has consumed us. For it should never be forgotten, that *more than one-third of the people of England are its labouring people*, distinguished from its upper, middle, and operative classes, and that it is with this lowest labouring class that *population thickens with the greatest rapidity*. With the classes above the labouring class, there is wealth, or, at least, a tolerable means of subsistence; and with these better circumstances come forethought and prudence, generally disposing such persons to defer marriage to a reasonable period, and sometimes to abstain from it altogether. It is not true, from this cause, that the people who possess the best means of subsistence are the people who increase the fastest. We have done something, we hope, towards disabusing our coun-

trymen in reference to that long credited fallacy. It is with our lowest class that forethought and prudence are at the lowest point, and it is there, in consequence, that population rises to its highest rate of increase. This is the great—the righteous law of Providence. The measure in which the few degrade the many to a state of ignorance and squalid poverty, is the measure in which they prepare a scourge for their own back—in which they give strength to the elements that soon or late must destroy them. Witness the insurgent multitudes of Old Rome and Byzantium, kept down for awhile by shows and largesses, but a multitude which could never be trusted to face an enemy in the time of war, nor as capable of performing a single virtuous action in the time of peace, and which in due time consumed the parent that gave it being. Look to Ireland, and, in short, to any country subject to a grossly corrupt government. It would be folly, and worse than folly, to attempt to conceal from ourselves that we have a multitude of this description increasing constantly over the whole land, increasing faster than any other portion of the general community. These will be the parents of a large proportion of the generation to come. These children—the children of ignorance and poverty—are almost everywhere growing up as such, and as such will be bequeathed to the state to deal with as it best may. Upon this class our educational means are producing small impression. The great mass of them being themselves uninstructed, have no adequate feeling of the value of instruction, and their great aim seems to be, to convert their children into a source of profit as soon and as largely as possible. The school is evaded, that the merest pittance may be gained from the field or the factory. Let these grossly untaught multitudes come to be only in a slight degree more formidable than at present, and let any strong blight come upon our means of subsistence, or upon our means of employment, and to the hunger-bitten millions of Ireland, we may have to add an equal number in the same state of maddened wretchedness in England; and before such an insurgency, the power of the strongest government may be as nothing, and, in an hour when we think not, a wound may be inflicted on our national greatness, from which recovery will be impossible. To pursue our present course is to end thus—to perish, as all great empires before us have perished, our ignorance and our vices having become stronger than our knowledge and our virtues. Here, then, is the evil—an evil which must be subdued, or it will assuredly subdue us. This accumulating ignorance—this lowness in all senses—we must vanquish, or be content to be vanquished by it. In what way, then, may we address ourselves,

with the best prospect of success, to this great work of Self-preservation, of Patriotism, of Humanity, and of Religion? This is our next question.

III. It will be remembered by our readers, that in our last number we stated that the article then printed on this question was in type before we had seen the pamphlet published by Dr. Hook, or had become at all aware of its contents. To the independent judgment then expressed we still substantially adhere. The adoption of Dr. Hook's plan, either in its extent, or in more than a few of its details, never entered our head. But so far as his scheme set forth a broad platform, inviting men of every communion and class to unite for the better education of their common country, we regarded it as generous and noble, and we hailed it as such. With the motives of Dr. Hook we had nothing to do; and we think that some other people would have shown their good taste in abstaining from any affectation of unusual penetration on that point. Had we seen reason to suspect Dr. Hook's sincerity, we should not have feared the issues of a race between craft and honesty, and should still have avowed our approval of a course of action commending itself to our judgment as one of equality, justice, and sound promise. The extent, however, in which we were at one with Dr. Hook, and in which we were at issue with him, will be obvious from the following passage :—

‘ Popular education also, it is intimated, is again to become a question of government. On this subject, likewise, our great wish has respect to what we hope our rulers will *not* do. We should deprecate to the utmost their doing anything which might tend to disturb the existing apparatus in relation to this object. We take it for granted, that no such scheme as the recent one by Sir James Graham is for a moment contemplated. Consequent on the destruction of that measure, great effort has been made by nonconformists to extend the means of popular instruction. The congregational body alone has raised £100,000 for that purpose. Other denominations have given proofs of the same public spirit. No project that should break in upon the machinery thus called into existence would find favour, or even endurance, with the nonconformists of England. The territorial or parochial plan of originating schools, as in Prussia, would be wholly inapplicable to the social, or rather to the religious state of England. It is not in the power of any government to give existence to anything like the continental system in this country. The utmost that an English government can attempt with any show of wisdom, would be to encourage all the available voluntary effort of the friends of education, and to originate schools itself only in such districts as are ascertained to be destitute of the requisite local agency. It might aid and supplement voluntary effort, but it must not attempt to supersede

it, nor be allowed to cross its path so as to impede it.—We maintain most earnestly, that the most matured social condition is that in which the people are in the greatest degree educated, and in the greatest degree *self-educated*; and that all state patronage of education should be conducted with a view to that result.’—pp. 268—270.

It is, we hope, scarcely necessary for us to say, that we are far—very far from meaning to undervalue the indirect or reflex benefit of voluntary effort, in respect to education, as in respect to everything social. We have never been believers in the silly notion, that a despotic government would be the best government, if you could only secure a succession of wise and good men to act the despot. If we could create such a succession of men we would not create them. In things social, as in higher things, it is more blessed to give than to receive. It is better to be employed in doing the state some service, than to exist as a mere pensioner upon its care and bounty. Had we the power to make such a distribution, we would not place all the vitality in one brain, and leave a paralysis to rest on every brain beside: Men feel attached to their country in proportion as they feel it to be their *own*—an object about which *they* have to care, and in relation to which *they* have to act. It costs them something, and they are interested in it accordingly. It would be better, therefore, infinitely better, that the public interest should be advanced by the people themselves than by the solitary capacity of a despot, even though it should not advance so rapidly, nor upon the whole so wisely. It is practice which develops power. Men become wiser in their endeavours to communicate wisdom, and more virtuous as they endeavour to add to the common stock of virtue. It is thus, not with great men merely, but with all men. It is the glory of Englishmen that they look to themselves for so much, and to their governments for so little. This voluntary spirit is our national spirit, and in its maturity we have the proper manhood of nations. Of course, this principle must have its limits. We never expect to confide in voluntarism for a national revenue.*

But on these grounds we regard the amount of self-derived education realized by the people of this country as something almost sacred. The statesman who should attempt to break in upon it, directly or indirectly, would be resisted to the utmost, and would deserve to be so resisted. The British and Foreign School Society, and the National School Society, have both done eminent service. If the educationist would accomplish his object, he must cease to look on these societies as hindrances—he must learn to hail them as coadjutors. It must not be his object to deprecate their labours, but to do his best to extend them, and to give them a higher and a more effective character

Such, we venture to say, must be his course in relation to all voluntary effort. His aim must be to strengthen such effort where it is, and to call it forth where it is not. He must work with it, must help it, and must have enough of the Englishman in him to account such fellowship in labour an honour. Any attempt to extinguish this spirit of self-instruction among the people would be nothing short of treason against them.

Unhappily, as a state, we are not yet in our condition of manhood as regards education. Our first and our great want is a race of educated parents. The agency which should secure that object might give to our country a chain of educated generations. At present, it is not knowledge, morality, or religion that is likely to be thus perpetuated in our humbler classes, but their opposites. To secure the better result in this case, three things are necessary—Schools, Schoolmasters, and Scholars.

With regard to school accommodation, if that were our great difficulty, we think public liberality might be made to meet that exigency without any further aid from the state. This we say with the full conviction that the present amount of accommodation is very far from being adequate to the wants of the country. As we shall presently see, there is a difficulty of much greater magnitude behind this difficulty, and one which, so long as it exists in its present force, must greatly impede the required provision in the shape of mere school-houses. Concerning the existing provision, also, in this shape, great misconception prevails. The Report of Lord Kerry states the total increase of day-scholars, between the years 1818 and 1833, as 671,243. On which Mr. Baines remarks:—

‘We can hardly suppose the amount expended in the *erection* of day schools between 1818 and 1833 to have been less than the amount expended between 1833 and 1846—namely, 2,000,000*l* sterling. If *new schools were provided* for 671,243 scholars, as we may infer from Lord Kerry’s returns, they would cost at least as much as the schools for 600,000 scholars *built* since 1833. Nor is it of any consequence, whether the schools were public or private: if private, they were provided by private competition; if public, by public benevolence. And in my view, my lord, it would be as great a calamity to destroy the freedom of private competition as to quench the benevolence of the public.

‘If the above calculations, all founded on official documents, be correct, the following will be the aggregate result:—

‘Expended by the people themselves on day schools, from	
1818 to 1833	£2,000,000
Ditto, ditto, from 1833 to 1846 (exclusive of public grants)	1,500,000

Total since 1818 . . . £3,500,000

Pretty well for the despised voluntary principle!—*Letter V.*

We are sorry to say anything tending to disturb a statement put forth evidently with so much feeling, but self-defence somewhat obliges us to this course. It is to be observed, 1st, that the returns in Lord Kerry's report are returns as to the increase of 'schools' and 'scholars,' not as to the increase of school-houses, or of places 'erected' or 'built' for the purposes of education; 2nd, we are not left wholly in doubt, as the above passage might lead one to suppose, as to the comparative number of the scholars in public or in private schools. If our readers will turn to the Summary, page 448, they will see that of the total number of day-scholars in 1833, 152,314 is the number in endowed schools—schools not of recent date, for the most part, and not requiring any new 'erection' to receive them; and the number in all the private and self-supported schools was 691,728; leaving only 343,900 as the scholars in subscription, charity, or public schools, for whom buildings, like those erected by the National School Society since 1833, would be required. The private schools were, no doubt, assembled, for the most part, in private houses, from the elegant mansion receiving its upper-class boarding-school, down to the most miserable room or cellar, described by Mr. Noel and by the Manchester Statistical Society as serving the purposes of a day school. Mr. Baines assumes, that for the children attending endowed and private schools, constituting greatly *more than two-thirds of the whole*, there had been the same expenditure incurred that would have been incurred had such accommodation been provided for them in new buildings by the National School Society. In some cases, no doubt, the conductors of these private schools did build their own school premises, but such instances would be rare—not more numerous, probably, than the instances in which the children belonging to public or subscription schools were taught in previously existing premises, accommodated, at little cost, to school purposes. 3rd. Of this 343,900 also, reported as in schools supported in whole or in part by subscriptions, and for whom we suppose such provision to have been really made, it is to be observed that this is the total of that class, not for the interval between 1818 and 1833, but upon the whole number attending day schools in 1833, including the 671,243 given as increase since 1818, and the 516,000 given as the number attending previously. We must divide the above 343,900 in half, accordingly, if we would ascertain somewhat about the number for whom public school provision was made between 1818 and 1833; and then, instead of putting down Two Millions as the sum expended in school-building, during that space, we must be content to put down about *one-fourth* of that amount, the number of scholars to be provided for, being

171,950, not 671,243. When we first read the paragraph we have cited, we understood Mr. Baines to say (and this he certainly does say) that this 671,243 scholars, were scholars for whom 'new schools were provided,'—that is, 'erected'—'built,' after a rate of expenditure the same with that of the National School Society in such cases, his comparison all along being between the expense incurred, according to Dr. Hook, by that society in providing accommodation for 650,000 since 1833, and the parallel expense of providing the same sort of accommodation for this 671,243 prior to that year. But to suppose *such* an *increase* in the *actual attendance* of such scholars between 1818 and 1833, was to suppose an increase of *accommodation* provided during those years for at least a million of children, and an expenditure accordingly of not less than three millions sterling! That there was a great error somewhere here we were convinced. The Report itself makes everything intelligible enough. The expenditure was not more than half a million.

In the same letter, Mr. Baines speaks of our Sunday schools, with their 'two millions of scholars' and 'three hundred thousand teachers,' and expresses great admiration of these institutions, and of the persons who so generously sustain them, in which admiration we wish to be understood as sympathizing to the full. But here again we have more sympathy with the feeling of Mr. Baines than confidence in his figures.

'This,' he writes, 'is a benefit no more to be measured by money than was the apostolic gift for which Simon Magus proffered his base pelf. Yet as money has been mentioned, and as our faint-hearted doctors, of both churches, and political as well as religious, have so sadly mistrusted their country, we may follow the arithmetical bent of one of them, and calculate our expenditure. Lord Kerry's incomplete returns give 16,828 Sunday schools in 1833. It will be far below the truth, if I say that we have now 20,000 Sunday schools. Suppose that they cost on the average 250*l.* each, the result is, that the people of England and Wales have expended FIVE MILLIONS sterling in the *building* of Sunday schools within the present century.'

Here we have the same confounding of a 'school' with a school-house, or with a 'building,' raised, or appropriated at considerable cost, for the purpose of receiving a school. We have seen to how limited an extent this brick and mortar expenditure is necessary in respect to day schools, keeping in view the great number of private schools. In the case of Sunday schools such expenditure is still less generally needed. Some thousands of these schools are conducted in day schools, in which case the expense of the building has been already reckoned. Fully as large a number of them, probably, are conducted in chapels, in vestries, in hired rooms, especially in the case of

branch schools, and of the schools connected with small chapels, and in villages. But not a grain of allowance is made for these facts in Mr. Baines's calculation. Twenty thousand *schools*, are synonymous with twenty thousand *buildings* erected from Sunday school resources; and it is by counting each of these school buildings, real and imaginary, at an average cost of 250*l.* that we have the total of FIVE MILLIONS sterling! Many convenient, and some very noble buildings, have no doubt been raised purely for the benefit of Sunday schools, but if this five millions were reduced ONE HALF it would, we think, for the reasons assigned, be much nearer the truth.

The numbers of Sunday schools in England and Wales, in 1833, were 16,828; the number of *children* and *adults* in those schools were 1,548,890, which gives an average of 92 scholars to each school. The numbers of Day schools in the same year were 35,896; of Day scholars 1,187,942, which gives an average of 33 scholars to each school. Thus we may conclude, that there were then 8000 Sunday schools, with scholars varying through all the gradations from 92 downwards; and that there were nearly 18,000 Day schools, with scholars varying from 33 down to the lowest possible numbers. • Do men build costly school-rooms, do they, except very rarely, build school-rooms at all, to receive Sunday scholars in such numbers, or Day scholars in such numbers?

We hope we have said enough, on this occasion and on others, to show that we are not likely to under-rate the worth of the principle of free offering and effort on the part of our people, and we are quite aware that to some persons we shall appear to be taking upon us a very ungracious office in venturing to question calculations put forth with the intention of serving that principle. But we regard Mr. Baines's figures as open to much exception, and it is necessary that we should give at least an instance or two, as indicating the ground of that opinion. We might prosecute this scrutiny further, and in a manner that would be serviceable to our argument, but we prefer, for obvious reasons, leaving that task to other hands. We must not be expected, however, to conceal from our readers our conviction, that the tendency of Mr. Baines's Letters is greatly to over-rate what has been done by the free offerings of the people in regard to popular education, and as greatly to under-rate what still needs to be done, and that the effect of this double error is likely to be an amount of mischief of which he seems to be wholly un-suspicious. Under his guidance, not a few of our self-reliant contemporaries seem eager to commit themselves to they know not what.

With regard to the point of school accommodation there are several fallacies that should be distinctly understood and exposed.

1. The *character* of this real or supposed accommodation must not be overlooked. How far does it consist of edifices raised and separated as schools: or of private houses, rooms, or cellars rented and appropriated to such uses? So far as the accommodation may consist of regular school buildings, it may seem to partake of a character of permanence and certainty; so far as it may consist of hired and appropriated places only, it may be accommodation existing in one year, and ceasing to exist in the next. Ninety-nine in a hundred of the persons who read what is written just now about existing school-accommodation, understand by such accommodation existing school-houses, built for the most part with public money, and if the amount of provision said to have been made were really of that description, the result would be highly cheering. But to think so, is to be deluded. Full two-thirds of the school accommodation existing in 1833 consisted, as we have seen, of hired houses, or rooms, many of them of the lowest description, dependent generally for their continuance as places of instruction on private interest and feeling.

2. The *equal distribution* of the means of instruction is of great importance. We are happy in thinking that, at present, the places wholly destitute of schools are few compared with the places which either possess good schools, or at least Sunday schools and Day schools of *some* description. But the places without schools at all, and the places without schools of any real value, taken together, constitute a large portion of the country, and nothing can be more fallacious than to suppose, that if it can be made to appear that the school-accommodation in the aggregate is something like equal to the wants of the people, the business of school provision is pretty well completed. It is manifest, that this provision may exist in excess in some districts, and may leave a miserable destitution in others. Now, this is really the posture of things, not in this district nor in that, but as affecting the country generally to a large extent. There might be equality in the aggregate, and the work of popular education be not more than half accomplished, from the want of equality in the distribution. In judging of school accommodation, we must look to three things respecting it—its *amount*, its *character*, and its *distribution*. All reasoning which does not keep these three points steadily in view will inevitably mislead. Overlooking these considerations, we may learn to exult in our work as done, while in fact the sterner half of it remains to be accomplished.

3. The third fallacy on this question is, to suppose that to

provide *school-accommodation* is to provide *the means of instruction*. The great difficulty in the way of securing this equalized distribution of good school houses, results from the greater difficulty of being able to secure the same distribution of good schoolmasters. The best guarantee for the success of a school is an able teacher, and it is now pretty generally felt that without the prospect of that guarantee a good school house may be only a waste of money. The Rev. Mr. Burgess, who is cited as an authority in such matters, tells us, that school-houses for half a million of children are still needed. If so, then quite a million and a half of money is wanting in this department. With the more hopeful of our contemporaries, we could believe that even this sum might be raised, and without the aid of any government grant, within a moderate number of years, if the friends of education in England and Wales could bring themselves to think that this done, their work would be done, or even in great part done. But the two great wants necessary to the usefulness of this large expenditure would still remain—a supply of competent schoolmasters, and the means of securing to such masters a reasonable livelihood. In our present circumstances, we have to regret, to a large extent, the absence of this agency, and of the means necessary to sustain it, and with so much uncertainty as to the success of the effort, in vain, would be an appeal to the liberality of the public for so large an outlay. If the value of school-houses depends on the supply of schoolmasters, the supply of schoolmasters depends on your being able to secure to such functionaries a sufficient means of subsistence. We must not expect to find a race of men and women willing to become martyrs to poverty for the sake of being employed in conveying the elements of instruction to the children of the humbler classes of our people. Such persons may like their employment, and may be prepared to make some reasonable sacrifice in favour of it, but this self-denial must not be made to sink below a certain point, if the supply is not to prove unequal to the demand. But it is one of the evils inseparable from a large portion of our day schools, connected with our particular places of worship, that being shut up to a particular place and sect, they can rarely afford to give a sufficient salary to their schoolmaster or their schoolmistress. In rural parishes, and in all thinly peopled districts, this evil must be in constant operation. Hence, besides the million and a half of money necessary (which Mr. Baines says might be soon raised) to provide the still required school-accommodation—a sum by the way which would need to be much increased, if the new provision is to keep pace with the constant increase of the population—beside this sum, there would be need of a large and permanent

fund, by means of which the strong might help the weak, as regards the regular support of these new schools. For no object is it more difficult to raise money in this country than for home missions, and the case of distant schools would, we are sure, be much more hard to plead than the case of distant religious interests. Indeed, we have no institutions so thoroughly dependent on local feeling in their favour as our schools. As regards their current expenditure, their conductors rarely think of looking for aid from a distance, and they do not expect anything, because they know it would be in vain to expect it. School management is so liable to negligence and abuse, that it would be useless to calculate on persons becoming contributors, upon a large scale, to schools of whose proceedings they could know nothing, except by distant report. We are aware that school societies have been formed with the view of meeting this difficulty in the case of Ireland, but the history of those societies has not been such as to warrant us in believing that a machinery of that nature could be made to work very successfully in England.

No one acquainted with nonconformist statistics can fail to have seen that our doing—or rather our not doing, in respect to daily secular education presents our weak side. We have many laymen, and many ministers, who have been earnest, self-devoted men in this department of labour; but these persons constitute only a small proportion in the great body of nonconformists. It is much easier to find parties ready to enter with zeal into some project connected with Foreign Missions, with City Missions, or with efforts to convert the Jews, than to find the same number of men and women prepared to watch, and guide, and sustain the comparatively dull routine of a daily school. We repeat—there are highly honourable exceptions to this prevalent apathy, but we have seen enough in this connexion to be convinced that our experience must have been singularly unfortunate, if the rule and the exception be not such as we have stated. We who here write confess our own faults when we say, that nonconformist ministers in general make little sacrifice to promote the interest of day schools, compared with what is made by a large proportion of our established clergy. We are aware of the circumstances which furnish some valid excuse to the dissenting pastor in respect to this comparative deficiency. He has less of the means necessary to originate and sustain such institutions, and less time to devote to them. Still the case is as we have stated, and nothing is more observable in the reports of inspectors than the fact, that in rural parishes, the day school is nearly always originated by the clergyman, and that it is prosperous only in proportion to his measure of oversight, and his willingness to make personal, and sometimes

great pecuniary sacrifices in its favour. It is a good deal so in our towns and great cities. In regard to Sunday schools, the public spirit of nonconformists is greatly in advance of that of churchmen. In all districts not strictly agricultural, the children in nonconformist Sunday schools are nearly double the number to be found in schools connected with the established church, and in general the nonconformist schools are much the most efficiently conducted. But in Lord Kerry's Report it is stated, as our readers will see on page 448, that of 35,986 day schools, 867 only were originated by dissenters, and of 1,187,942 day scholars, only 47,287 were found in schools of the latter description. We are satisfied that much more was done by dissenters in aid of daily secular instruction, even at that time, than is indicated in these figures. It has been the manner of dissenters, and was especially so some twenty years since, to unite with liberal churchmen in such plans of usefulness, in preference to originating separate action of their own. What was doing in 1833, moreover, is no rule by which to judge as to what is doing in this respect in 1846.

The pledge of the congregational body to raise more than 100,000*l.* in five years in support of day schools is a great redeeming fact. But in respect to these contributions, each contributor retains the power of locating the expenditure of his subscription, according to his pleasure—assigning it in part to the British and Foreign School Society, in part to the committee of education connected with the Congregational Union, and in part, or entirely, as he may prefer, to his own locality. We regret, however, to say, that in consequence of this arrangement, and judging from the course of things hitherto, it will be less than a tenth of that 100,000*l.* that will be given to assist the more destitute localities. This experiment, accordingly, praiseworthy in some respects as it is, holds out small promise of our being able to equalize the distribution of schools and schoolmasters through the country, on the principle which requires that the populous and wealthy districts, should aid those which are thinly peopled and poor.

If we take the population of England and Wales as sixteen millions, and reckon the term of day-school instruction upon an average of five years, the number of all classes who should be found in day schools would be two millions. We have at present less than a million in our public day schools, which may be said to leave the half million mentioned by Mr. Burgess as the number to be provided for in that form. This, of course, supposes that a large number of our common day schools, pronounced generally to be so valueless, would cease to exist. Suppose this half million, then, divided equally between churchmen and dissenters: churchmen, already so greatly the chief educators in our day schools,

adding another quarter of a million to their pupils,—and nonconformists, rejecting all government aid, being thrown strictly upon their own resources, and pledged to become the educators of the remaining quarter of a million,—suppose the Congregationalists to undertake to provide school accommodation and school instruction for 100,000 of this quarter of a million; the Methodists to undertake for another 100,000, and the remaining religious denominations, the remaining 50,000,—can we persuade ourselves that the nonconformist portion in this division of labour would be really accomplished? All things considered, congregationalists would be bound to commit themselves to at least as much of this effort as we have assigned to them. Let us glance, then, at what would need to be done by this body in the case supposed.

The schools required for this 100,000 children, on an average of 150 children to a school, would be 666. If we reckon the cost of these schools in building at 400*l.* on an average, we have a total of nearly 266,400*l.* This sum would be required for school premises alone, unless we suppose such premises to be already existing to a considerable extent, being at present used only as Sunday schools, from the want of means to support a day school. This is, no doubt, the fact in many places, and on this account, we may perhaps reduce the needed expenditure for school buildings to 200,000*l.* At what rate, then, must congregationalists become contributors to a school fund, so as to secure the required amount of school accommodation—say, in the course of the next ten years? Clearly, they must be contributors to the extent of 20,000*l.* annually. This should be their contribution towards school buildings alone, and these school buildings must be a gift, for the most part, from the more wealthy districts to the more needy. But this is not all, nor the greater part of what they will be required to do. Beside supporting existing schools, and endeavouring to bring the greater part of them into higher efficiency, means must be found to do something very considerable towards *supporting* these 666 new schools. The great majority of these schools would be required in places where the people have been too poor to support a day school, and where they cannot be expected to incur such responsibilities in future, unless they should be aided very materially in meeting the current expenses of such an institution, as well as in raising the building. If this assistance is to be such as to dispose those who would not otherwise have opened a day school, to do so, it must not be less on an average than 20*l.* per annum. Well, the total of 20*l.* per annum to 666 schools, would be 13,786*l.*, which would require that the pledge of 20,000*l.* a year for the next ten years, should be gradually raised until it should

exceed 30,000*l.*, if the money expended on brick and mortar is not to be wasted, and there are to be *schools*, as well as *school-houses*. In these calculations, no account is taken of the extra money that must be expended in support of normal schools, or to aid in the training of good masters. Nothing is said of what may be the cost necessary to bring many of our existing schools into a better state; and nothing as to the material fact, that during these ten years, the population will have increased considerably. If congregationalists shall determine to resist all state aid in popular education, then we must be allowed to say, that it will behove them to pledge themselves to effort on this scale for the next ten years, and when those years are passed, to hold themselves ready to furnish not less than 12,000*l.* annually for all time to come,—and this, not in aid of schools in wealthy and populous districts, but as aid extended to normal and needy schools, on the principle of a great permanent school mission society. Nor should it be overlooked, that public spirit on this question must be up to this level with all our religious denominations, if our country is not to suffer fearfully, as the consequence of being left thus entirely to private bounty. Some good men can expect all this from the religious principle of the different bodies of Christians among us. We are satisfied, that to give a secular education to the whole nation does not belong to the religious men of it, and if an experiment is to be made on that assumption, we feel assured that it will prove delusive. The tendency of such expectation, moreover, were it acted upon, would be dangerous to the last degree. It would not only end in failure, its effect must be to give the evil we are all so anxious to subdue, licence to grow—to grow, so as to rise more than ever above our control, and to prove irresistible for all coming time! If it be said—our churches need not incur such expenditure, they may avail themselves of existing accommodation in their respective districts. Our answer is, that in a multitude of places this accommodation does not exist; and if it does, can you expect to take your chapel peculiarities into a district school? If you lean thus on the mere citizenship of your neighbourhood, must you not learn to respect the rights of that citizenship; and if so, what becomes of *religious* education, in the form on which you insist?

But may we accept assistance from the state in this matter consistently with a due regard to our liberties as men and Christians? On this point, we have not ourselves the shadow of a doubt. We have said, once and again, that we do not expect to see any measure adopted by our government of a nature to disturb our existing school agencies. The plan which might be adopted with the least disadvantage, and with the best prospect

of permanence and usefulness, would be, in our judgment, something like the following:

1. That the annual grant of money in aid of popular education be increased.

2. That this increased grant be distributed in aid of school instruction, as well as in aid of the erection of school buildings.

3. That no grant be made either towards the erection of buildings, or towards the sustenance of schools, except in conjunction with voluntary contributions, raised in the locality of such buildings, or of such schools towards those objects.

4. That the proportion of these grants should not be uniform, but rise to their maximum in favour of places deemed the most necessitous.

5. That the government inspection in relation to the schools thus aided should be strictly confined to the general education given in them, and to their moral discipline.

6. That the religious education be left in all cases to be determined by the school committee, that committee being always chosen by the subscribers to the school fund, and possessed of full power to appoint or dismiss the schoolmaster, and otherwise to regulate the affairs of the school.

7. That in schools where the children belong in considerable numbers to parents of different religious denominations, the direct religious teaching by the schoolmaster, or by ministers of religion, should be confined to particular school hours, as approved by the school committee, and that the attendance of children during those hours should be left optional with their parents.

8. That the administration of all government money for these purposes be vested in a permanent Board of Education, constituted, as far as may be, of persons who may be understood to represent the different sections of the general community.

Were we disposed to raise objections to this scheme, we confess that we could do so to some extent: and if we do not attempt to meet all the exceptions that may be taken to it, our silence must not be attributed to our not having seen them. Our conviction is, that, as a whole, a scheme of this description requires only that measure of common sense and good feeling which we have a right to expect from all professed friends of education, in order to its being worked in a manner to avoid the world of mischiefs which some good men see in the train of what is called 'state-education,' and to realize an amount of good literally incalculable. The general effect of the plan would be to augment the number of schools affiliated with the National School Society, and with the British and Foreign School Society, leaving the schools themselves in nearly the same condition as at present. Catholic schools, and a very small number beside,

would be the only exceptions to this tendency of such a movement. Theorizers may magnify the difficulties of such a project, practically they need not be in any degree formidable. In schools conducted on this plan, all the advantages of the general instruction given might be laid fairly open to all.

By such a course, the nation would merely resolve, through its government, to do its duty. Religious men would be sure to do their share, and more than their share, towards the general education of the people, but the people at large would be taught to bring their own agency to the work; and our day schools, ceasing to be mere charity schools, and becoming places in which the people would feel they had a right to instruction, this whole class of institutions would rise in popular estimation. They would be no longer schools connected in so exclusive and conspicuous a degree with sects and parties, but would become in the general apprehension much more schools for the people. That the effect of assistance from government, if administered in the manner described, would be to diminish voluntary effort we cannot for a moment suspect. Probability and fact are alike against such a conclusion. The mind, we think, must be the complete victim of its prejudices, which can even seem to doubt whether the government aid already afforded in encouragement of school building has been really favourable to the increase of such buildings. Further assistance from the same source, if only kept within reasonable limits, and regulated by the same principle—the principle, not of *dispensing* with local and voluntary effort, but of *calling it forth*, would naturally act, in our circumstances, not as an incubus but as a stimulus.

Faulty as the continental systems are, we should be glad to think that the nations of the continent would have had something better if left wholly to themselves. But in the United States—a far better field in which to test principle of this nature—it is found that the states in which least is done by the government for education, are those in which least is done by the people.

‘The power of making a suitable provision for training their youth being vested in the separate states, the inequality in the condition of these institutions is not surprising. The ignorance that prevails in some of the south-western states, for instance, is a fact perfectly reconcilable with the fact of the intellectual superiority of New York and New England. Where there is activity in the government to extend instruction, there is a desire created among the people to receive it; where there is little or no legislative effort, the amount of instruction is as small as is compatible with any degree of diffusion of knowledge. The present state of education in the different states of North America is, in several points of view, deserving of attention, especially from those who are undecided about the advan-

tage of legislative interference. The problem is approaching its solution in a way which can hardly fail to work conviction in its favour. The facts already collected show, in the clearest manner, that, *in those states where the superintendence of government has been most vigilant, the results have been, beyond all comparison, favourable to the establishment of schools and the diffusion of knowledge.*

'The following table, derived from the best sources, shows the proportion of children who receive common school instruction to the whole population in several of the United States, and furnishes statistical evidence in corroboration of the above statement:—

'New York	1 pupil to 3·9	inhabitants.
Massachusetts, Maine, Connecticut	1 — to 4	—
New England	1 — to 5	—
Pennsylvania, New Jersey	1 — to 8	—
Illinois	1 — to 13	—
Kentucky	1 — to 21	—*

In Illinois and Kentucky the government does next to nothing for education, and the people copy its negligence; in New York and in New England the government is widely active, and the people are proportionately wakeful. In short, everything in this respect depends on the manner in which the state becomes an agent—as a helper with the people, or as a power independent of them. We cite the following account of the state of primary instruction in the state of New York, about ten years since, as bearing on this point, and for some other reasons:—

'There are fifty-five organized counties, and 811 townships and wards, in the state of New York. Distributed through these townships there are 9600 organized school districts, of which number 8491 had made reports to the superintendent up to the end of 1831. At that time the reported districts contained 508,878 children between five* and sixteen years of age; and of those the large proportion of 494,959 were stated to have attended the schools during, at least, part of the months appropriated to teaching. In the course of the year 1831, there had been 267 new school districts formed; and the number of districts from which reports were received was greater by 106 than it had been in the preceding year.

* Quarterly Journal of Education, vol. ix. p. 314.

'By the censuses of 1840, it appears that the number of primary and common schools amounted to 47,209, attended by 1,845,245 scholars; of whom 468,264 were taught at the public charge, the remainder at that of their parents and friends. From this it will be seen that education in America depends very much on the voluntary principle; but though primary schools were in all parts of the country originated and sustained at first, as in most of the States it continues to be, by the people themselves, or rather by the friends of education, State after State is beginning to be induced by the efforts of these friends of education to make a legal provision, to a certain extent at least, for the instruction of all who may choose to avail themselves of it, for in this, they do not see that they violate any rights of conscience.' (Baird's Religion in the United States, p. 328.) It thus appears that the opinion in the United States that popular education is not a matter to be left to charity is a growing instead of a declining one.

‘The average number of scholars in each school was fifty-five, and the schools were kept open for the reception of pupils during an average period of eight out of twelve months. The numbers of scholars given above must be understood to comprehend all who had been on the school lists during the year; and it must not be inferred that each scholar had enjoyed eight months of instruction during that time. The progress of the system of public instruction in the state of New York may be judged from the fact, that, in 1816, the number of organized school districts was only 2755, and the children who were taught during that year were returned at 140,106. The number of public schools, as well as of scholars, has consequently increased in fifteen years to the proportion (comparing the numbers at the beginning and end of this period) of *seven* to *two*. It is certainly an extraordinary circumstance, and one which shows how highly the advantages of instruction are prized by the inhabitants of New York, that in so considerable a part of the state as was comprised in the returns, *thirty-five* out of *thirty-six* children, between the ages of five and sixteen were, at some period of the year, attending the public-schools. If we take into account the many circumstances, which, in a country where the demand for labour is great, and labourers are well paid, would induce many to quit their studies before the age of sixteen, we may almost venture to pronounce that every child within the reported districts receives, or has received instruction.’—(Journal of Education, vol. ix. p. 59.)

It is intimated in the above passage, that American schooling, in common with continental schooling, rarely extends to the whole year. But when it is shown that the *entire* population of the state of New York, between the age of *six* and *sixteen*, with the exception of a fraction not worth naming, are found at school *every year* during those *ten years*, for at least some months of the year, the educational statistics of that state will perhaps appear, as better fitted to call forth emulation than merriment—especially when we think of the tide of low emigrants constantly setting in on that territory. It is true, in some states, many of the younger children of both sexes are taught during the summer months by females, but we are by no means sure that this is not a feature in American usage which we should do well in some measure to imitate. We have read, within the last few days, the Reports of the Annual Visiting Committee of the Public Schools of the city of Boston for 1845, and a document of the kind more honourable to the men whose labours it records, and whose opinions it expresses, has never come under our notice. We doubt much if a school report, so thorough, so faithful, and so intelligent, has ever made its appearance among ourselves. We cite the following passage as showing the light in which the services of female teachers in boys’ schools are regarded by men of sense in America :

' Most of the school committee, and most of our fellow-citizens, have been so long accustomed to the present organization of our schools, that its extraordinary character does not, perhaps, strike them. Perhaps few have examined this organization, in comparison with that of other schools of high standing. Let us look at it, therefore, as though it were not our own. Take one of our boys' schools, for instance; here are five hundred children, from seven up to fourteen or fifteen years of age; who are to be taught reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, geography, &c. How do we divide them, and organize the school? We divide them by a perpendicular line, into two classes,—not according to age, not according to acquirement, but according to the principle of making two separate and independent schools, of equal age and acquirement, with two independent masters, each having equal jurisdiction; one being master of one half all the morning, the other of the other half, and then exchanging in the afternoon.

' Now, suppose, instead of this, that we should divide the scholars horizontally, or according to their age and acquirements,—placing the older or more advanced half in the upper room, and the other half in the lower room; the whole to be under the general care and superintendence of a head master, whose immediate sphere of duty, however, should be in the upper room, in the care and instruction of the *older* children. The lower room, with the *younger* children, should be under the care and instruction of a *female* teacher and her *assistants*; for all reason and modern experience show us, that women are by nature better fitted than men to teach and train *young* children.

' As it will be necessary to have a head master of the highest character and acquirements, and as his responsibilities, both in and out of the school would be greater than at present, the actual salary might be increased.

' In order to secure the most capable and accomplished women for teachers in the junior department, it would be necessary to pay at least \$4000 per annum; and thus we might keep at home those superior teachers who now go to the south and west to get higher salaries than they can get here.

' By this simple and feasible plan, we should obtain higher kinds of service, and have better schools; while by substituting one lady for one master, and even two female assistants for one usher, we should save the salaries of sixteen masters at \$1500, and sixteen ushers at \$600, being thirty-two persons, to whom we now pay \$33,600, and have in their place forty-eight competent female teachers, to whom we should pay only \$144,000 thus making a clear saving of \$19,200 per annum in the item of salaries, excepting only what might be allowed by way of increase of the masters' salaries.

' Will any one venture the assertion, that we cannot find women of energy enough to take care of and teach a school of boys *under twelve years* of age, with a *head-master in the same building to be called upon in any emergency*, in the face of the fact that, all over the civilized world, such things are done? Or in the face of the fact that, at

this moment, in our Boston schools, hundreds of boys are so-managed; for we have said, the head-master usually leaves the management and care of the younger boys to his female assistants, and often knows not, and cares not, what she does with them.*

So speak the examiners of the Boston public schools in 1845, in language befitting the capital of that portion of the United States, where a native man not able to read would be a man wondered at; and where the indentured of every apprentice requires that he shall be allowed to attend school, so as to make himself acquainted with the Rule of Three before ceasing to be an apprentice, and being called to his duties as a citizen.

The last thought to enter the head of an American would be that of suspecting the governmental influence of his country in popular education as unfavourable to liberty.

Equally foreign to his thoughts is the notion of any sort of sequence between admitting the magistrate as a coadjutor in popular education, and admitting him as a despot in relation to the pulpit and the press. The American has learnt to distinguish, as we have not, between things social and things religious, and has known how to place each on its separate and proper basis. The man who should address his cautions to that people about the danger to general liberty, supposed to be inseparable from allowing the state to become an assistant in education, would be in their view a person who should hardly be allowed to go abroad without a keeper. They have no doubt—not the shadow of a doubt—that the effect of education, even of such state education as obtains in France and Prussia, will be to put an end to irresponsible power; while among themselves, nothing could sound more absurd than to harangue them as men having a *choice* between *knowledge* and *liberty*—to preserve popular freedom being in their view utterly hopeless, except as they can succeed in their endeavours to perpetuate popular intelligence. Nor is this feeling as to the tendency of popular education, even when regulated by state enactments, to preserve popular freedom, peculiar to the United States. On the Continent there are states which possess freedom, as truly as in America, and it may be well to hear an American express himself, in relation to such States, even where education is made compulsory.

‘One of the most signal features of the school system of Prussia, and of many of the neighbouring states, is the universality of the children’s attendance. After a child has arrived at the legal age of

* With the exception of the State of Connecticut, where all the public schools are maintained upon the interest of a large school fund, primary instruction is provided for by an annual assessment—a school being taught in every school district by a *master for the elder youth during winter*, and by a *mistress for the little children during summer*.—Baird’s Religion in the United States, p. 327.

attending school, whether he be the child of noble or peasant, the only two *absolute* grounds of exemption from attendance are sickness and death.

‘I had frequent conversations with school teachers and school officers respecting this compulsory attendance of the children. From these sources I gathered the information that, with one exception, there was very little complaint about it, or opposition to it. Were it not that some of the children *are compelled to receive instruction in a religious creed from which their parents dissent, there would rarely be a murmur of complaint in the community.*

‘It should be added, however, that parents are not obliged to send their children to a public school; if they prefer it, the children may be sent to a private school; but they must be sent to some school.

‘A very erroneous idea prevails with us, that this enforcement of school attendance is the prerogative of despotism alone. I believe it is generally supposed here, that such compulsion is not merely incompatible with, but impossible in, a free or elective government. This is a great error. With the exception of Austria (including Bohemia) and Prussia, almost all the other states of Germany have now constitutional governments. Many of them have an upper and lower house of assembly, like our senate and house of representatives. Whoever will attend the parliament of Saxony, for instance, will witness as great freedom of debate as in any country in the world; and no law can be passed but by a majority of the representatives, chosen by the people themselves.’ In the first school I visited in Saxony, I heard a lesson “on government,” in which all the great privileges secured to the Saxon people by their constitution were enumerated; and both teacher and pupils contrasted their present free condition with that of some other countries, as well as with that of their own ancestors, in a spirit of congratulation and triumph. *The elective franchise in this, and in several of the other states of Germany, is more generally enjoyed,—that is, the restrictions upon it are less than in some of the states of our own Union.* And yet, in Saxony, years after the existence of this constitution, and when no law could be passed without the assent of the people’s representatives in parliament assembled, a general code of school laws was enacted.

‘In many of the German states, the anniversaries of the date of their constitution are celebrated by fêtes and shows, by dinners and speeches, as we celebrate our great national festivals the fourth of July; and yet, in these states, by virtue of laws which the free representatives of a free people have enacted, every child is compelled to attend school.’*

* Manu’s Report, pp. 185—190. Strange that the *prevention* of crime should be a greater infringement of liberty than its *punishment*. The liberty to remain ignorant, to become, almost of consequence, vicious, may well rank with the liberty to starve, of which Carlyle so truly says in his ‘Past and Present;’ ‘Gurth is now ‘emancipated,’ long since; has what we call ‘Liberty.’ Liberty, I am told, is a Divine thing. Liberty, when it becomes the ‘Liberty to die by starvation,’ is not so divine. Liberty requires new definitions.’—Past and Present. W. H. B.

The following letter, addressed to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, in August last, expresses views, in reference to what the state may consistently do in relation to this question, which we hold to be sound:—

‘Sir,—From the *Leeds Mercury* of Saturday last, I learn that you have given a place in your pages to Mr. Edward Baines’s second letter to Lord John Russell on the question of popular education. It appears, also, that you have made some comment on the contents of that document. I am not aware of the manner in which you have met the reasoning of my valued friend; but, with your permission, I would offer a remark or two upon it. It is probable that the views of Mr. Baines will prove to be those of a large body of protestant dissenters; but I happen to be one of a class—not an inconsiderable class, I suspect—who do not see the question in the light in which it presents itself to the editor of the *Leeds Mercury*; and there are considerations which make it desirable that the reasons of this difference of judgment should be distinctly stated.

‘It is alleged by Mr. Baines, that any interference of the state with regard to popular instruction must proceed on a false principle—the principle that it is a duty of the state to train the mind of the people. In proof of the erroneousness of this principle, it is urged, that, if we admit it in the least possible degree, we are bound, in consistency, to admit it in the utmost conceivable extent, as embracing, not only reading and writing, but the doctrine of the pulpit, the censorship of the press, and a hundred things of like nature.

‘But is it true, in affairs of government, that a principle which may not be acted upon to the fullest extent, and in all circumstances, must be a false principle, and one that should not be acted upon at all? I think not. The principles of abstract science are thus immutable, and there are some general principles belonging to social policy which resemble them. But these last are very few in number. The consistency insisted on in the above objection, instead of being the rule in political science, can hardly be said to have any place in it. The great end of government is to secure the best development of the national resources and character. This is its great principle, and there are not a few subordinate principles which receive their limitation and law from this one. We are all sensible that there are rules of action constantly arising from circumstances, which we feel to be every whit as binding as any strictly natural law can be, and which, in fact, derive their authority from their relation to such more general and comprehensive principles.

‘For example, it is a principle of the English constitution that “the subject shall not be taxed without his consent.” It will be admitted, I suppose, that this is not a false principle. But in this principle, as a seed, we find the doctrine of universal suffrage. Carried out consistently and fully, it stops nowhere short of that point. On that suffrage, accordingly, the English constitution should have been based

from the age of King John downwards. Should we say in this case, that a principle not admissible in all circumstances, and to any extent, can be admissible in no circumstances, and to no extent? The history of the English constitution, during the last seven centuries, certainly seems to teach another doctrine. It teaches, that a principle may be accounted just and salutary as acted upon up to a certain point; and that it may be tacitly regarded by a whole nation, and for centuries together, as a principle that would prove unjust and unsalutary if pushed beyond that point. The principle which would make suffrage commensurate with taxation, has been ruled by the higher and more comprehensive principle having respect to the best means of securing the best development of the national resources and the national character. In short, suffrage to all, suffrage to a part, and suffrage to none, have been alike just in the history of nations. Where the people do least for themselves, the government must of necessity do most; and where the people are capable of doing most for themselves, the government should do least, and should be thankful to see its province reduced daily to a smaller and still smaller compass. Governments, I consider, are good or bad, not so much according to abstract theory, as according to the wisdom with which they have been conformed to this law of adaptation.

‘Take one or two more illustrations, in adopting the elective principle, we may be gravely cautioned of the danger we incur in so doing. Admit that principle in any case, it may be said, and consistency will require that you should admit it in all cases. Let the members of your Lower House of Parliament be appointed on that principle, and you pave the way to an elective peerage, an elective monarchy; in short, to a state of affairs in which all things will be elective. So, again, in respect to female magistracy. Admit a female to the throne, the very highest point of legal and administrative authority, and where can you stop? Surely, after such a step, females should be freely admitted as the makers of law, as administrators of law, and as competent to every department of government. So, also, of voting by ballot. Insist on the ballot-box at the hustings, and why not insist upon it in the senate-house, and when you panel a jury? In these cases, and in a multitude beside, will it be said, admit a principle anywhere, and you should demand it everywhere? I presume not. In short, politics proper are made up of instances of this kind—facts involving principles, but principles which are everywhere subject to restriction and modification from the presence of some more comprehensive and much higher principle.

‘Does it follow, then, that in conceding to the state the right to institute a certain number of secular schools, we concede to it a principle which would give it warrant to invade the liberty of the pulpit, the liberty of the press—in a word, all liberty? By no means. With regard to the advantage of elementary secular instruction, the nation is agreed; but with regard to the advantages of any particular form of religious instruction, it is everywhere divided. There is, moreover, a scriptural reason why civil government should not take upon itself the

office of a religious teacher; but there is no such reason to preclude it from imparting secular or social instruction to those who would otherwise be destitute of it. These facts, in my judgment, point very clearly to the line which separates between the kind of instruction to which the state may extend its aid, and that with which it may not expediently or justly intermeddle. For these reasons, it may be the duty of government to do something even towards training the mind of the people, and it may be anything but its duty to proceed beyond a certain point in that direction. In the history of governments, the most momentous principles, as we have seen, are constantly stayed in their application, by reasons of much less weight than these reasons.

‘No man of sense will deny that there is a strong tendency in power to augment itself, and this new function of the state among us would, no doubt, require to be jealously watched. But I am satisfied that it might be, and would be, so watched as to be rendered on the whole eminently beneficial.—On the soil of Europe the certain effect of education is to destroy tyranny, or to prepare the free for a still wiser and larger freedom. That such would be the effect of a more widely diffused education in this country is a point on which I have no sort of doubt. The agencies which have made us what we are, have in them a pulsation and onwardness never to be controlled again even by priesthoods, much less by schoolmasters.

‘To the opinions of Mr. Baines, and of some others who think with him on this subject, I have long attached great weight. But it is not by the reasoning contained in his second letter to Lord John Russell that the principle of state interference in respect to popular instruction can be shown to be false.

‘There are some other material views of this large and vital system, on which I shall probably, by permission, give expression to a few thoughts through your columns,

‘I am, Sir, &c.

‘ROBERT VAUGHAN.

• Launceston Independent College, Aug. 10.

The only objection to the argument of this letter we have seen, as one possessing the least weight, is that taken to the passage which asserts the great end of government to be ‘the best development of the national resources and character.’ The word ‘character’ in this connexion, has been fixed upon as giving all sorts of warrant to government interference. But substitute the expression ‘the general interest,’ for the ‘development of resources and character,’ and the change will be found to be one of mere words. It is impossible to separate between the interest of a nation and its character. To say that a government may consistently do its best to help a nation to grow rich, but that it must not be supposed to care a jot about the influence which this money-getting may have upon its habits of industry, its intelligence, or its tone of moral feeling, would be to make

distinctions, the weakness of which becomes manifest the moment they are stated. The end of government and the end of society it has been said—and we think truly said—are one. The general interest is the ultimate design of both: and in what that interest consists it belongs to society itself to determine. By government, in every well-ordered state, we are to understand a power created by the state, and dependent upon it. Government is the expedient of society, the instrument which society forms for itself, that it may thereby realize its proper end. Society is the master, government is the servant. Man was not made for government, but government was made for man. The question, accordingly, about the province of government resolves itself into a question about the best division of labour. Christianity we regard as precluded from being an affair of government by its nature and its express laws; but with regard to nearly all other things, the general interest is the great law and end to be observed, the matters which may be best done if left wholly to society being so left, and the matters which may be best done if assigned in whole or in part to the government being so assigned. Hence, if it can be made to appear, that popular education, like provision for the poor, would be best conducted by admitting a certain measure of agency from the government, it would be legitimate to admit that agency. That children should obey their parents is a principle, and that subjects should obey their sovereign is a principle, but there is a still higher principle having respect to the highest parentage and the highest sovereignty to which the other principles named are subordinate. In like manner, it may be the duty of a government to become an educator to a certain extent, and there may be a wider view of the general interest, requiring that it should not become an educator beyond a certain point. In no respect are men betrayed into error on questions of this nature more commonly, than in their attempts to lay down immutable rules, to be applicable in their fullest extent, to all circumstances and all times. On this principle Alfred should have waited for universal suffrage, and the separation of church and state, before committing himself to his duties as a monarch or a Christian!

Dr. Vaughan's second letter touches on the possibility and desirableness of keeping the general instruction of our public day schools distinct, in some cases, from their religious instruction; it enters also somewhat further into the question concerning the true province of the magistrate:

In my former letter I have endeavoured to show that the principle assumed by Mr. Baines, as opposed to all government interference in

popular education, is untenable. I have, at the same time, admitted that the principle urged by my friend would be sound if the education to be given were a religious education.

‘But here it is objected that the proposed distinction between a secular and a religious education is impracticable. Every school, it is said, must be subject to moral discipline; and how, it is demanded, can you enforce the lessons of morality without verging upon religion, without becoming, in fact, a religious teacher? At first sight, this objection may appear formidable, and it will probably present itself to many honest minds as an insuperable difficulty. But the difficulty is imaginary. It is an objection which cannot be valid against the connexion of a civil government with secular schools, without being at the same time fatal to the very existence of such governments. The moral principle, and the religious principle—if it must be so called, which is felt to be necessary to the salutary discipline of a school, is not greater than will be found to be inseparable from the foundation, and from all the usual proceedings of a civil government. Every legislature, and every court of justice has its basis on the assumption that there is a moral law, that man is the subject of a moral government, owing obedience to a moral governor. Every law enacted is the issuing of a great moral lesson. Every penalty inflicted is an emphatic enunciation of a truth of that nature. Nor can it be denied that every law of man supposes a higher law in the constitution of the world—a law of God, of which each law of man is only a particular application. In my view, accordingly, to say that a civil government should not extend its sanction even to so much of what is moral and religious as would be necessary to the wholesome discipline of a daily school, would be, in effect, to say that there should be no civil government. If such a government would be vitiated by giving its sanction only thus far to an inculcation of the principles of morality and religion, then is every government of that kind already vitiated—vitiated to its core, and from its very nature. Politics are the morals of nations. Political science has ever been an important branch of moral science. Now is it possible to sever the general duties of men from the higher authority which has imposed them.

‘Now, let it be said that the separation between secular and religious instruction in schools for which we plead is impracticable; and let it be clear, as I think it is, that this difficulty can no more be excluded from the policy of a civil government than from the discipline of such institutions; and what then becomes of the plea for a general separation through the land between things civil and things ecclesiastical? Why, the dissenter must be prepared to see this plea become a failure, or he must consent to distinguish between the distinctive theological doctrines of our different religious communities, and that amount of moral and religious principle which is of necessity recognised by all magistracy. If he must insist that morality and religion are inseparable from school discipline, then he must concede that the same things are necessary to the right conduct of a civil government, and that the union, accordingly, between things temporal and things spiritual,

against which he so loudly protests, is not only a union which *may* be, but a union which *must* be. There is no avoiding this issue, except by distinguishing between the doctrinal truths which Christians derive exclusively from their Bibles, and those elementary truths of a moral and religious nature which are anterior even to revelation, and essential to every government which is to prove itself *a terror to evil doers and a praise to those who do well*. Let this distinction be acknowledged, and we may then have schools subject to a thorough moral discipline, and the centres of a high moral influence, and may still regard them, in all consistency, and integrity, as purely civil institutions. It is with me a maxim, and one which I do not think any logic can disturb, that government *may* be a moral teacher to the extent in which it *must* be a moral administrator.

‘Nor should it be forgotten that it is a new thing with dissenters to feel any difficulty on this point. When an attempt was made some years since to secure access for nonconformists to the means of secular education in our universities, without obliging them to commit themselves in any way to the religious teaching of those places, no man throughout the ranks of dissent appeared to doubt the reasonableness or practicability of such a separation of the literary and scientific from the theological. The concession was not made, and all classes of nonconformists agreed in attributing the refusal to the narrow selfishness of the refusers. Our language was, not only that the party adverted to might have done that thing if they would, but that the plea of religion set up by them for not doing it was a worthless and hollow plea. When the London University was instituted—instituted for the purpose of imparting secular instruction, and such instruction only,—nonconformists generally gave it their approval. The cry raised against it as irreligious, because not professedly religious, as “atheistic,” because not professedly Christian, all fair-minded men knew well how to interpret. It was regarded by nonconformists as the bad pretext by which political partisans and church intolerants sought to accomplish their particular ends. When the government scheme of education for Ireland was introduced a few years ago, the congregational board of London, and the ministers of the three denominations voted resolutions, and presented a memorial to government in approbation of what was done. The cry of ‘No Popery,’ and ‘No Atheism,’ which the enemies of a liberal government contrived to get up on that measure, was not only spread through the land, and proclaimed with due theatrical effect in some memorable public meetings, but was borne with no less memorable parade to the gates of Buckingham palace, and even to the foot of the throne! Protestant nonconformists were observant of these very religious proceedings, and estimated them at their proper value.

‘Now, there are some of us who are not prepared to unsay in this respect all we then said. We feel that, were we now to assert that secular education cannot be separated from religious education, we should need to do much more than revoke our approval of the Irish Education Bill; it would behove us to condemn all possible grants of

public money for education purposes; to abstain from all connexion in future with the London University, and to forego all attempts in time to come to bring our old universities to the condition of national institutions. Our colleges should at once cease to be affiliated with our metropolitan university, and our students who have taken their degrees and honours there should not think of making any use of them. The professor in a college, and the teacher in a day-school, have alike their mission to 'the mind of the people'—the only difference between them being that the mission of the former is much more comprehensive and influential than that of the latter. Let it be maintained, then, that separation between secular and religious instruction is impracticable, and we are bound in consistency to retrace our steps fully to the extent above stated. In short, our whole argument for the separation of spiritual things from temporal things is lost.

'Within the last few weeks, property, which it is conjectured may yield little less than 100,000*l.*, has been bequeathed to found a university in Manchester. To this sum it is expected another 100,000*l.* will be added by public contribution, and in a few years Manchester may possess a university which, while not inferior to any existing establishment in its means of general education, will at once take as regards practical science an unrivalled position. But this institution, according to the forms of the bequest, will extend its literary and scientific advantages equally to the men of all creeds—knowing nothing of religious tests. Must the men of these parts look coolly upon their great Northern University, because based on this distinction between things social and things religious? I leave the sort of sagacity which has hitherto distinguished them to answer that question.

'Another conclusion, no less embarrassing, follows from this assumption. Religious men may not mean to say, that they deem themselves, as such, to be the only proper conductors of education. They would say, probably, that the responsibility of educating the young rests upon parents. But suppose parents to be so negligent of this duty that it is felt to be quite necessary that society should endeavour to supply their lack of service, and then let it be assumed as a principle, that the education thus supplied must be religious, whether coming from voluntary effort or state aid, and what follows, but that we should account religious persons as the only persons competent to the work of teaching? And can it be expedient—nay more, can it be just—that religious men should take up such a position in relation to general society? Could it be modest, could it be even-handed in them so to do? The religious pretension which invades a natural right must be false. Society, as such, has its own immutable principles—principles which are older even than our Christianity, and not less sacred. We are agreed that a religious education is the preferable, and the only complete education; but this conviction does not oblige us to assert, that a merely secular education must be valueless, and to determine that the alternative tendered to society at large shall be to receive our religious teaching or none. To dissenters, I would say, with every possible feeling of respect, but at the same time with distinctness

and emphasis, Place such a course of proceeding in what light you may to your own apprehension, be assured its effect upon the community will be to expose you to the charge, from the great majority of your countrymen, of merging all your principles as men and patriots in your one feeling as religionists. For my part, I cannot consent to occupy such ground, and painful as it is to me so to do, I feel it to be my solemn duty to declare, in the most public manner possible, my reasons, and the reasons of many who think with me, for pursuing another course.

‘But admitting the separation of secular from religious education to be practicable, is it desirable? The answer to this question by very many, both among conformists and nonconformists, will be in the negative. Such persons are filled with alarm, as they imagine the land covered with some thousands of men and women, as teachers of youth, and who will not be teachers of religion, and who from this cause, it is presumed, will be themselves irreligious. But such a conclusion is not reasonable. In this country it could never be the policy of any government to aim at such a result. Every government school would, of course, be placed, as far as possible, under the superintendence of the benevolent and religious persons in its neighbourhood, and an effectual check might thus be laid on mischief in that form. Let a school be once denounced as a badly conducted school, especially in a populous district, and the consequence must be, its reformation or its extinction. No one dreams of a law that should compel parents to send their children to a school where they would be getting more harm than good.

‘I have had the temerity to speak of the cry which has sometimes been set up in behalf of what is called religious education as artful and insincere; and some of the allusions in this letter are sufficient to indicate the ground of this conviction. But, while I believe many pious persons are most honest in their demands on this point, and while I admit that many teachers in daily schools do their best to give a religious cast to their instructions, I am still obliged to repeat, that I have a very humble opinion of the direct religious teaching which is given in day schools, or that ever can be given in such institutions. Nor do I speak without experience on this subject. I have served more than one apprenticeship in the superintendence of schools on the British system, and the great benefit of such schools I have always found to consist, not in any direct religious impression produced by them, but in their adaptation to prepare the young for receiving religious instruction with advantage elsewhere. My experience, in this respect, must be, I feel assured, that of the great majority of persons who have been observant of the working of day schools. In other departments, men soon become alive to the advantage of a division of labour; and why should not popular education partake of benefit from such arrangements? Why might not one part of education be given by the schoolmaster, another by the parent, by the minister of religion, or by the Sunday-school teacher? Does religion cease to be a part of education, because not taught by the person who teaches reading and arithmetic? In fact, is there not danger that

sacred things may lose something of their sacredness by being mixed up with the rough and often noisy routine of a day school? One would think that to give religion a place apart after this manner, and to approach it with a special seriousness, would be to secure attention to it, only the more becoming and promising. Sure I am, there are many considerate and devout persons, who would prefer such a method purely on account of its better religious tendency. Let the day school inculcate a reverence of truth and justice, and a love of everything kindly, generous, and noble hearted, and let the directly religious instruction be grafted upon such teaching, and it will be the fault of the agents, and not of the method, if you do not realize a scheme of popular education of the highest value. Nor can I doubt that an intermixture of the children, of all sects in such schools, would tend to abate our sectarian animosities, and render the next generation, in that respect, an improvement on the past.

‘In my next letter, which will be my last, I shall touch upon the necessity of the proposed state interference, and the means by which it may be made effectual.’

The argument of this letter supposes, that in any new or enlarged movement, instances may arise in which this separation between the general and the religious instruction would be necessary. But such instances would be very rare. We have all along supposed our existing machinery to remain undisturbed, and that National, British, Catholic, or other Denominational schools would continue, in this respect, much as they have been. It seems to be felt that to describe the common schools of the United States, as unfavourable to *liberty*, would be worse than useless: how far they may be described as unfavourable to *religion*, may be perceived in the following passage, from the pen of that sturdy voluntary, the Rev. Robert Baird:—

‘In most cases, a pious and judicious teacher, if he will only confine himself to the great doctrines and precepts of the gospel, in which all who hold the fundamental truths of the Bible are agreed, *can easily give as much religious instruction as he chooses*. Where the teacher himself is not decidedly religious, much religious instruction cannot be expected; nor should any but religious teachers attempt to give anything more than general moral instruction, and make the scholars read portions of the Scriptures, and of other good books.’

‘The Bible is very generally used as a reading-book in our primary schools; though in some places, as at St. Louis, the Roman-catholics have succeeded in excluding it, and they have been struggling to do the same in New York, where they will, probably, sooner or later, succeed. In so far as relates to public schools, I see no other course but that of leaving it to the people themselves; the majority deciding, and leaving the minority the alternative of supporting a school of their own. This will generally be done by Christians, rather than give up the Bible.’

'Primary instruction in the United States owes almost everything to religion, as the efficient cause of all the principle that prompts to its promotion. Not that the protestants of that country interest themselves in the primary schools for the purpose of proselytizing children to their views, but rather that at these schools the youth of the nation may be qualified for receiving religious instruction effectually elsewhere, and for the due discharge of their future duties as citizens. And, however much they may wish to see religious instruction given at the common schools, they will not for a moment give in to the opinion that all is lost where this cannot be accomplished. Primary instruction, even when not accompanied with any religious instruction, is better than none: and in such cases, they that love the gospel have other resources,—in the pulpit, the family altar, and the sabbath school.'—(Religion in the United States of America, pp. 329, 330.)

The utmost that need be required among us in any case is, that the religious teaching should be restricted to particular hours, and that attendance during those hours should be optional. And is this small concession—a concession which does not preclude religious instruction from a single school, but rather provides for it, and which does not put the least restriction even upon the time of administering such instruction, except in very rare cases—is this concession too great to be expected from religious men, as to the feeling of society at large, in favour of a great national object? Should the plan of the government demand no more than this at our hands, we may lay our account with seeing it accepted generally by Episcopalians, by Methodists, by nearly all our English Presbyterians, and by Catholics. It would be approved, moreover, by that large portion of general society which is not mixed up with any of our religious parties. Opposition, if opposition must be made, would be almost confined to the Independent and Baptist denominations, and to a portion only (how large or small time only can tell) even of those bodies. In what we say on this question, we wish not to be understood as representing either of these bodies of Christians. This, unhappily, is a subject on which many of the friends of this journal do not see alike. It must be sufficient to say, that our own views are in substance those of a considerable body of intelligent men among protestant dissenters.

What, then, are the points we may be said to have established?

1st. That in England and Wales we have a population of Sixteen Millions of people, with nearly Half of that number unable to write, and with a Third unable to read; and that the labouring class, and the humbler class of operatives, in which this want of such instruction, and of the wholesome habits which it generally indicates, is found, is that portion of our population which is

multiplying with the greatest rapidity, everywhere fast gaining ground upon the upper and middle classes, and menacing our country with the fate which has awaited nearly all great empires—that of perishing, in some evil hour, by the hands of the poverty, ignorance, and vice, which it has fostered!

2nd. We have seen that nothing can be more fallacious than the reasoning just now current about school accommodation. The numbers reported as attending schools can be no certain guide on that point. Full two-thirds of the children who receive instruction of some sort in this land, are not taught in school-houses—in places built for such purposes. But were this much more the case than it is, and were the existing school-houses adequate, as an aggregate, to the wants of a country, great part of these buildings might as well not exist at all, as be distributed after their present manner, giving excess in some places, and leaving others miserably destitute.*

3rd. We think we have made it clear also, that the existence

* There is one method of dealing with a portion of our statistical authorities on this topic against which we must be allowed to protest. Certain persons are appointed by the Committee of Council of Education to act as inspectors of certain schools which have received aid from government. The inspectors appointed to visit schools connected with the church of England, are appointed by the Committee and by the authorities of that church, the other inspectors are appointed by the Committee alone. In the Reports furnished by these persons, they invariably describe the schools to which their inspection is restricted. But they sometimes mention the number of children in these schools as compared with the local population: and other men cite what they so state. But the disputant assumes that what was meant as a description of one class of schools only, and which is said to have been so meant, is designed to pass off as an account of the entire day-school instruction in such places, in all schools, whether public or private; and he then calls upon all men to mark with becoming indignation the fraud which unprincipled or grossly ignorant persons have thus attempted to practise upon them. But this is in fact, to impute crimes to men which they never perpetrated, for the mere pleasure of seeing them gibbeted!

Dr. Vaughan has a right to complain of his friend Mr. Baines on this score. In his third letter, Dr. Vaughan has cited testimony of the above description respecting Oldham, Wigan, Blackburn, &c., stating at the time the particular *class* of schools to which the figures quoted had reference, and adding, '*the Reports above cited of course take no cognizance of private schools.*' Nevertheless, in Mr. Baines's letters, Dr. Vaughan has his place, once and again, with the herd of supposed blunderers who do not know how to distinguish between *public* and *private* schools; nor between the nature and value of Reports having reference to schools of *one* description, and Reports having reference to schools of *all* descriptions! Mr. Baines's long and loud flourish about Oldham, proceeds wholly on the assumption that Dr. Vaughan had committed this gross error; while Dr. Vaughan's words—printed—and before the eyes of Mr. Baines while he thus wrote, prove that he was fully upon his guard against fallacy in that shape. It is quite true that Dr. Vaughan regarded the 671,243 day-scholars cited by Mr. Baines as the increase of day-scholars between 1818 and 1833, as consisting, for much the greater part at least, of scholars in *public* schools. But that impression followed naturally enough from Mr. Baines's own representation of the matter—a representation which, as we have seen, gave that gentleman two millions in favour of his argument, in place of about a quarter of that amount. Here Dr. Vaughan did err in the manner imputed to him, but the error came to him second-hand—came to him from Mr. Baines!

of an adequate number of school buildings must depend very much on the probability of adequate means for the support of school instruction; that the expense of school buildings must always be as nothing compared with the current expenditure necessary to give to such buildings a real value, and that even the supply of school-houses, accordingly, must not be expected, until men see in the prospect of school-support a guarantee that the money spent on buildings will not prove to have been so much substance wasted.

4th. We have shown that the notion of its not being within the province of a civil government to aid public-spirited persons in diffusing sound social intelligence among the people, is a misconception with regard both to the nature and design of magistracy—it being necessary to the nature of that power, if it is to have any stable resting-place, and to be entitled to the confidence of society, that it should exist to great moral ends, and seek those ends by the use of moral means—precisely such means as it would employ in endeavouring to secure to the masses of people the intelligence and moral culture without which it is in vain to expect them to be good citizens. Declare civil government incompetent to such a service, and you leave it without moral power—that is, without anything of the power necessary to constitute it an ordinance of God. Account it a religionless thing, because it is not formally Christian, and to save it from weakness and contempt, you must consent to a union between the priest and the magistrate—between the church and the state. If you would have the civil power stand alone, you must leave to it the means of so standing, and not denude it of everything that may give it favour either with God or man.

5th. We trust also, that we have made it appear that there is a wide and unoccupied surface over which the means of education may be extended without at all disturbing the religious character of the instruction now given, or that may hereafter be given, in our day schools; and that in the few instances where any restriction on that point may be necessary, it need not amount to the exclusion of religious teaching from a single school—to nothing more than a restriction of direct religious instruction to particular hours. We think we have also shown, that nothing but mischief could possibly come to any party which should refuse to make this small concession in favour of an effort so nearly affecting the prosperity, perhaps the existence of our country. We should not object to the instituting of a class of schools in which the teaching should be wholly literary and moral; but we see nothing in the state of things about us to render such a course necessary in a single instance, and we know how easy it would be for some good people to give very bad names to such schools, and to array the passions and prejudices of the unreflecting against them.

6th. Enough also has been said, we think, to demonstrate that nothing can be more unreasonable than the apprehension that popular instruction may be made subservient, through any long interval, to arbitrary power. The educational systems of the Continent which are allied with such power, did not create it, but were created by it; and whatever may have been the intention of the men who devised those systems, it is through their influence that the people in those states are now rising fast towards the possession of the rights to which their growing intelligence entitles them. Not a few have already risen to a state of freedom, and are looking to their schools, not as to an agency unfavourable to liberty, but as to the means by which their most valued acquisitions of that nature may be best transmitted to those who shall come after them. All things combine to show that knowledge leads to freedom, and that ignorance makes a clear path before oppression and every evil work. Hence the tendency in the most free states, both of Europe and America, is towards expanding and improving their educational systems in connexion with their respective governments, rather than towards the dissolving of that connexion. The priestly party in Belgium made an experiment in the opposite direction, and the salutary warning presented in the result is not likely to be forgotten.

Finally, we have endeavoured to show, that religious men ought not to assume that the general education of the country has been committed to their hands; and, further, that should they insist on this work being left wholly in their charge, they will commit themselves to a responsibility not a little perilous to their own reputation, and fraught with the greatest conceivable danger to their country. The extraordinary demands already made on the resources of men of this class in favour of the many noble enterprises in which they are engaged, leave them without the means necessary to such a service. The few of this number who are wealthy, are already subject to constant demands on their liberality; and the great majority of congregations through the land do not furnish anything like adequate means of support to their ministers. To expect the opulence of a comparatively small number of persons to furnish the supplies necessary to sustain the school missions that would be required in the case supposed, would be to expect and to be disappointed; and it is not too much to say of the greater number of congregations in England and Wales, that if left to themselves, few of them would become just towards a schoolmaster, without *ceasing to be just, in a still greater degree, towards their pastors*. School-houses might be provided, but school *sustenance*—that would be the ever wearing difficulty. In short, the thing needed would not be done: men would everywhere point at it as not done; and the blame of

its not being done would be cast on the parties who claimed this service as exclusively their own, and who, when put upon their trial, were found wanting. In such case, the language of men in general would be, that the interests of the nation had been sacrificed at the shrine of an intolerant sectarianism, and the parties regarded as the causes of so much mischief would be judged of by their fruits, and that through many a year to come.

But let our zealous state-educationists beware. The suspicion deeply seated in the mind of the persons who are now pleading so earnestly against all government agency in this service is,—that whatever may be said for the present by the advocates of that agency, they mean nothing less than to break up all our existing organizations, in favour of one uniform territorial scheme, after the Prussian fashion. This suspicion has to be exorcised; and to expel it, our politicians must be frank and explicit in their avowals as to their ultimate object. Superintendence, inspection, the publication of school-books, liberty in the choice of teachers—all such matters must be so left as to satisfy reasonable men that there will not be any mischievous or vexatious interference in relation to things of that nature. This much the people of England may justly demand; and this much, we doubt not, will be honestly conceded to them—at least, by all the parties on whose integrity their interests in this respect materially depend.

With regard to the grave question of compulsory education—though it obtains, in the freest in common with the most arbitrary states on the Continent, nothing of the sort, in the form or measure in which it exists there, would be tolerated in England. Even there, indeed, the law is not that children shall attend the public schools, but simply that they shall be educated, publicly or privately. But with the mass of the people, this law necessitates attendance at the public schools, and brings with it all the daily meddling of a school police to enforce that attendance. But while nothing of this nature is to be thought of as admissible among ourselves, we know many intelligent and Christian men—men conspicuous for their enlightened attachment to civil and religious liberty—who despair of seeing the ignorance and vice of our population in any tolerable degree overtaken, without some element of this nature in our school habits. These persons reason after this wise:—‘The labouring and the operative classes of this kingdom constitute two-thirds of its population. Nearly half the children of these classes are sent to perform services in the field, in the mine, and in other places, at an age which leaves them without any day-school instruction of value. Submitting some extravagant descriptions on this subject to considerable abatement, it is not to be

'doubted that myriads of these children are great sufferers,—
 'sufferers to such extent as to expose our civilization to just and
 'bitter reproach, and that they grow up the subjects of the deep
 'wrong inflicted on them by the poverty or profligacy of their
 'parents. These children give us the one-third of our population
 'who cannot read, and the one-half who cannot write. We com-
 'pel parents to house, and clothe, and feed their children ; and is
 'it not as much an act of humanity towards children, and of
 'duty towards the state, to require that children shall not
 'be sent out for hire at so early an age as to be consigned of
 'necessity to ignorance and poverty for life ? Our Factory Act
 'supposes this state of things, and the obligations which arise
 'out of it, and fixes the age at which children shall not be em-
 'ployed in factories more than half a day, nor without a certi-
 'ficate of attending school the other half. But there is as much
 'wrong done to children by the manner in which they are em-
 'ployed in agriculture, as by the manner in which they are
 'employed in manufactures, and the manner in which they are
 'liable to be employed in mines is still more contrary to humanity.
 'Is it not the province of government to protect the defenceless
 '—especially when under age ? What has it done in favour of this
 'third of our population growing up unable to read, of this half
 'unable to write ? Next to nothing. Suppose a law passed,
 'and to come into operation some five years hence, requiring that
 'no child should be taken for hire under a certain age, nor with-
 'out a certificate of being able to read—leaving it wholly to the
 'option of parents to send their children to public schools, to
 'private schools, or to teach them at home. Would there not
 'be great humanity in such an act ? Would not the slight
 'degree of control thus laid on the liberty of parents, be eni-
 'nently conducive to our general liberties as a nation ? In over-
 'looking this fact, are we not in danger of becoming something of
 'the political pharisee—worshipping a form of liberty in the place
 'of its substance—the letter at the cost of the spirit ? Can it
 'be proper in a government, to respect pretensions to freedom
 'on the part of parents, so as to neglect the claims of justice
 'and humanity on the part of the child ? Can it be right to
 'lean as a protector to the side of the competent and adult,
 'rather than to the side of the helpless and infantile ? The plan
 'now suggested would not bring a perpetual meddling with
 'schools or with scholars—the thing to be settled *once and for*
 '*life* would be, that the child is *of a certain age*, and that the
 'child *can read*. Even the point of age might perhaps be
 'omitted—the ascertained ability to read being sufficient. Ad-
 'mitting that such a change in our usage as a people would
 'bring its difficulties, and would of necessity be a work of time,

‘yet if it should prove that it is only by such a measure that we may hope to obtain scholars, as well as school-houses and schoolmasters, would not the end abundantly compensate for all the cost of the means?’

To persons inclined at once to denounce the men who reason after the above manner, as conspirators against freedom, and as everything disreputable, we would only say, that the minds which indulge such thoughts are of a sort, for the most part, not to be greatly moved by the common declamation on such topics.

For ourselves, we hope to find that we are not shut up to the adoption of such a course. We can expect much from good schoolmasters, if we can only multiply them, and sustain them, in sufficient numbers. There are also many other means, short of compulsion, which have not yet been fairly tried. We admit, however, that the root of the evil, as regards a large portion of our labouring classes, lies in the state of extreme poverty to which those classes are subject. But if this fact suggests that the means of education alone will not meet the case, it suggests no less strongly that, without these means, all other means will be unavailing. To educate is to elevate, and there can be no elevation without it. ‘The condition of a large portion of our people greatly needs elevation; and in the name of everything humane, patriotic, and religious, let us give ourselves to the labour necessary to realise that elevation; but let us not commit so absurd a blunder as to put the improved means of instruction in abeyance, as if expecting to see this better social state grow up and adjust itself from causes independent of such agency. The case of the humbler classes of the community is complex, needing many appliances, but this particular appliance *along* with all, and *above* all. Nothing that is needful to raise the character of the people can we spare, and, least of all, that which is most needful. The condition of the poorer classes, accordingly, instead of furnishing an argument against pressing the question of popular education, is an argument urging us to the most earnest prosecution of it. Without education no good can be achieved in their behalf—in the train of education all good must follow. We do not seek education alone—we do not seek it for its own sake. We covet it, because of what must *accompany* it, because of what must *come after it*.’

Of the publications at the head of this article, we commend the pamphlets by a Manchester clergyman and by Mr. Swaine to the best attention of our readers. Mr. Swaine, especially, is entitled to much praise for the intelligence and unflinching principle with which he has laboured in this cause.

ART. IX.—*Reports of the Commissioners of National Education* in Ireland, from the years 1834 to 1845, inclusive.* Dublin: Printed by Alexander Thom.

‘AN APPEAL,’ published, in 1842, by the *Church Education Society for Ireland*, contains this passage:—‘Not only are the ‘clergy of the Established Church deprived of the *trust* committed to their hands by the legislature, of superintending ‘national education, but this superintendence is taken from them ‘for the purpose of being vested in a board composed of persons ‘whose qualification for their office essentially consists in their ‘being representatives of the most conflicting religious opinions.’

A brief historical notice of the manner in which this ‘trust’ had been exercised, is necessary to a right understanding of the question of education in Ireland; and, apart from its relation to any passing question, the subject is deeply interesting, as disclosing much of the secret of Irish misery, as bearing on the general question of religious liberty, and as tending to define the true province of government. Nowhere has the failure of government, as a *religious* teacher, been more signal and disastrous than in the sister island, nor could the results of a more thoroughly testing experiment be brought to bear on our present controversies. It is our purpose, therefore, in the present article, to state the facts of the case as faithfully as possible, and to assist the reader in forming a correct judgment respecting it.

The first act of the English legislature touching education in Ireland, was passed in the 28th year of Henry VIII. It was expressly designed to promote ‘the English order, habit, and language,’ instead of the Irish, and not to change the national religion, although the king was in that same year declared head of the church. On the contrary, the priests were commanded ‘to bid their beads in English.’ Each incumbent was obliged to keep an English school in his parish. Some measures of this kind seemed to the rulers of that day necessary in self-defence, however we may lament that those which they adopted were harsh and barbarous. Irish customs so encroached on the pale, that there was a remarkable proneness to adopt them on the part of the English settlers, though by reason of such conduct they became stigmatized in the eyes of the mother-country as a ‘degenerate’ race.

The civil wars which followed the accession of Elizabeth, prevented the law of Henry regarding parochial schools from being carried into effect. But it was renewed in the twelfth year of her reign. Each archbishop and bishop was bound to require of every beneficed clergyman, that he would, ‘to his wit and cun-

‘ning, endeavour himself to learn, instruct, and teach the English tongue, to all and every one being under his rule,’ &c. These enactments were again renewed by 7 William III., c. 4, which required every incumbent to take the following oath:—‘I do *solemnly swear*, that I will teach, or cause to be taught, an English school, within the vicarage or rectory of —, as the law in that case requires.’ A subsequent statute (8 George I., c. 12), enabled bishops and rectors to grant to each parish, the former two acres of land, and the latter one, for a resident protestant schoolmaster.

The great trust of superintending national education—of reclaiming a conquered people to civilization, religion, and loyalty—was thus committed to the established clergy, when all opportunities were favourable for exercising it beneficially. They were armed with full authority, and possessed of ample funds. There was no one to dispute their authority, or to resist their pleasure. The natives had been utterly subdued, ‘brayed, as it were, in a mortar.’ Any national strength which fire and sword had spared, famine, their ghostly attendant, slowly consumed away. Hence, when a law was passed, requiring the attendance of all the people at the protestant churches on Sunday, under a penalty, their bodies were generally there, though ‘curses, not loud, but deep,’ must have accompanied a service in a strange tongue, conducted by the ‘heretical’ successors of their own slaughtered or banished pastors. The resentment of the people, of course, raised a barrier in the way of the new preachers; yet kindness would soon have conquered every difficulty, had the gospel been inculcated by men of a Christian spirit in the Irish language. But that language was, for reasons of state, interdicted; and the clergy began their work of instruction by barring the only inlet of knowledge, and striking the nation dumb! The learners could not ask a question except in a language whose sounds were as those of treason to the ears of the teacher, whom, in their mournful silence and stupor, they regarded merely as the minister of an overwhelming tyranny, supplementing the work of the sword, by striving to reduce the soul to a state of spiritual thralldom and desolateness.

We pass over the troubled period of the Stuart dynasty, and come down to the era of the revolution, when the educational trust was solemnly recommitted to the hands of the established clergy exclusively: no other teachers were suffered to exist. ‘For nearly the whole of last century (say the Commissioners of National Education, in their sixth Report, 1839), the government of Ireland laboured to promote protestant education, and tolerated no other. Large grants of public money were voted for having children educated in the protestant faith, while it was

‘made a transportable offence in a Roman catholic (and if the party returned, high treason) to act as a schoolmaster, or even as a tutor, in a private family. The acts passed for this purpose continued in force from 1709 to 1782. They were then repealed, but parliament continued to vote money for the support only of schools conducted on principles which were regarded by the great body of Roman catholics as exclusively protestant, until the present system was established.’*—(See 9th Will. III., c. 1, and 8th Ann., c. 3.) It was also made a crime to send children to be educated out of the country.

So far, then, as law could do it, education without protestantism was rendered an impossibility. In addition to the parochial or elementary schools which the clergy were bound to establish and support, there had been founded a number of seminaries which afforded education of a higher order, and were also subject to the control of the same privileged body. But all these institutions were found to be utterly inadequate to the wants of the country; for the trusts had been generally neglected or abused, and the public funds converted to private uses. It was felt to be too bad, even by the administrators of the penal code, that the state should neither educate the people nor permit them to educate themselves, which many endeavoured to do at every risk. To take away all excuses from the ‘disaffected,’ and yet leave the clerical trustees of national education in undisturbed possession of the funds devoted to this purpose, it was resolved to adopt some new measures.

Accordingly, in 1731, a petition was presented to George II., signed by all the archbishops and bishops, and thirty other dignitaries, as well as many of the nobility and gentry of highest rank and station, praying for an *incorporated society* for the education ‘of popish and other natives.’ The policy which dictated this course is indicated in a letter from primate Boulter, written in 1730. The information it contains as to the inefficiency of coercion in matters of religion, is very instructive. The penal code failed even to keep up the number of the protestants, though it held out so many temptations to conformity.

The primate, who then ruled both church and state in Ireland, in his letter to an English prelate, says:—‘The great numbers of papists in this country, and the obstinacy with which they adhere to their own religion, occasions our trying what may be done with their children to bring them over to our church. . . . I can assure you that the papists are here so numerous, that it highly concerns us in point of interest, as

* See Collated Reports, p. 135.

‘well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow-subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion; and one of the likeliest methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for instead of converting those that are adult, *we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to popery.*’

When we reflect how strongly the interests of these ‘meaner people’ must have bound them to the church of the nobility, gentry, and government, at a time when ‘popery’ was not only a bar to all advancement in life, shutting out its disciples even from the right of earning their bread in any guild or trade, but was almost synonymous with treason, the fact of their secession from the ranks of protestantism suggests that there must have been great negligence on the part of the established clergy. In 1733, the charter was obtained, and a society incorporated, consisting of the highest dignitaries of the church, and the chief officers of state, who were *ex officio* members. The schools were first designed for the education of poor protestants as well as Roman catholics; but they were afterwards confined to the latter exclusively, and continued so till a late period, when the rule was again altered. This was the origin of the *charter schools*, so justly infamous in the eyes of the Irish people. Besides considerable private contributions, and endowments in land, the king gave 1000*l.* a year; and the schools were supported by large parliamentary grants, which were gradually reduced, and finally withdrawn altogether. In 1821, the grant was 21,615*l.* These were, of necessity, boarding establishments; for the end aimed at—namely, bringing over the children to the church—could not possibly be attained without cutting off all intercourse between them and their parents and friends. Accordingly, no relation, priest, or stranger, was suffered to speak to any of them. It may be imagined that it would not be easy to fill the schools on such terms, in a country where the instinct of parental affection is remarkably strong. But ‘any port in a storm;’ in times of *famine*, which were pretty frequent, there was no lack of pupils in the charter schools;—at other seasons, the supply of young convertible papists was so scanty, that it became necessary to establish ‘*nurseries*’ to meet the demand. These nurseries were supplied by children whom nobody claimed or cared about—foundlings, and children one of whose parents was a Roman catholic.—(Parliamentary Reports, 1825, vol. xii.)

It is the cleaving curse of exclusive systems, based on a violation of conscience, and of natural rights, that their agencies are corrupt and vicious, and that they admit of no effectual reform,

while they diffuse among the privileged classes a feeling of dependence on favouritism, fatal to self-reliance and honest industry, and, at the same time, a spirit of insolent intolerance and wanton cruelty. Let it be borne in mind, that the men to whom the control of this costly proselytizing machinery was specially committed, were the prelates of the church; that each school had attached to it a well-paid clerical catechist, and that masters were selected on account of their high protestantism and loyalty.

How, then, did the system work? No man can answer this question fully who has not read the *Evidence* taken before the Commission of Inquiry, which sat in 1824. A few leading facts, however, will give some idea of these nurseries of the church. As they were the ripest fruits of 'protestant ascendancy,' we feel it our duty to dwell on them a little, in justice to a better system, which still encounters bitter opposition from a party who would restore, if they could, the hateful principle on which the charter schools were founded—a party which is meeting with auxiliaries now, in very unexpected quarters.

For some years the charter schools did not attract much observation. But there were facts and rumours which excited suspicion; and the celebrated philanthropist, Howard, was induced to visit them in 1784, and again in 1787. In his examination subsequently before a parliamentary committee, he stated that he found the children generally ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-taught; 'sickly, pale, miserable objects—a disgrace to all society.' Some of them had been six years in the schools without knowing how to read, their time being occupied in working for their masters.

Sir J. Fitzpatrick, Inspector of Prisons, visited twenty-eight charter schools in the years 1786-7. According to him, the children were barbarously treated by their masters, and were 'puny, filthy, ill-clothed, without linen, indecent to look upon,' &c. The schoolrooms were dilapidated and dirty, though the private apartments of the masters and mistresses were comfortable. The Commissioners of Education in 1808, reported that no important improvement had taken place till the end of the century. In 1803, protestant children were again admitted, perhaps because others could not be obtained.

In 1817, '18, and '19, the Rev. Messrs. Thackery and Lee, episcopal clergymen, were sent by the governors to inspect the schools. They reported a shocking state of things. The children lived in hunger, nakedness, filth, and ignorance. Learning and religion were almost entirely neglected. The pupils were compelled to almost slave-labour, at farms, looms, &c., for the benefit of their masters. Of course, there were exceptions, and

some schools were allowed sufficient food and clothing. Yet even these pined under the withering influence of the system. The 'sullen and dogged' appearance of the children betrayed some dreadful violation of the laws of nature. Mr. Lee, comparing the least miserable of them with the children of Erasmus Smith's schools, and those of the Association for Discountenancing Vice, observes:—'I was invariably struck with the vast superiority in health, in appearance, in vivacity, and intelligence of the half-naked, and, one would almost suppose, half-starved children who live in their parents' cabins, over those so well maintained and so carefully instructed in the charter schools. In the charter schools, all social and family affections are dried up; children once received into them, are, as it were, the children, the brothers, the sisters, the relations of nobody! They have no vacation. They know not the feelings of home; and hence, it is primarily, whatever concomitant causes there may be, that they are *so frequently stunted in body, mind, and heart.*'—(Commissioners' Report, 1825, App. Nos. 55 to 73, and No. 74.)

This is an important remark, and applies equally to several other endowed schools in Ireland. Almost universally in such institutions, where large masses of children are congregated, the ties of kindred are broken or unknown, and nothing to supply the place of a parent's love, and no one to care for one child more than another; the inmates are indeed 'stunted in body, mind, and heart,'—stupid, sullen, selfish: the most careful religious teaching is generally as much lost upon them as seed cast on the highway. This fact should be well remembered in connexion with the discipline of our workhouses. The human heart, unblest with domestic affection, can hardly fail to become a soil fit only for the growth of the unamiable and evil.

Since recording this observation, we have found a striking confirmation of its truth, in the evidence of the Rev. James (now Dr.) Carlile, of Mary's Abbey, presbyterian church, Dublin, given before the same commissioners. (App. 263, p. 833.) That truly enlightened and respectable gentleman stated, that of all the children, amounting to seventy or eighty (we are not sure of the exact number), who left the charity school of that congregation during his incumbency, only *one* had become a communicant in the church; every Roman-catholic child went back to the faith of the parents, notwithstanding the most careful scriptural instruction; and of the females, a great majority turned out badly, and a large proportion became abandoned characters on the streets of Dublin. Dr. Carlile added, that he had found a similar result in the case of all other charity schools in that city. He

ascribes it to the want of *parental care*, as a mother or a father can inspire a salutary horror of certain temptations to which other teachers cannot safely allude. There is, doubtless, much truth in this; but there are causes for this lamentable defection from the paths of virtue, which lie deeper in human nature. Even the stunted hearts of such unloved young persons yearn for affection: consequently, when they meet with the semblance of it in the world, inexperienced and unguarded, they trust, are betrayed, and lost. Where the pure and healthy natural affections are not cultivated, the appetites flourish like weeds:—passion reigns where sentiment is dead or undeveloped. Besides, the wholesome air of public opinion (to which, perhaps, chastity owes more than any other virtue) cannot penetrate and purify the close atmosphere of our boarding-school prisons,—whose confinement stimulates the imagination, and gives rapid circulation to infection.

The first Commission of Education in Ireland was appointed in 1806. Fourteen reports were made under it, the last in 1812. It included two archbishops, one bishop, and the provost of Trinity College. Neither they, nor the official governors of the charter schools, succeeded in eradicating the vices of those institutions, or even in lopping off their most noxious excesses. A new commission was appointed in 1824; and to its honest, moderate, and judicious report we are indebted for our best information about the charter schools, and other educational institutions in Ireland. The commissioners inspected the former personally, and found them in the most unsatisfactory state. We shall select a very few examples. ‘The habitual practice of the master at Sligo was to seize the children by the throat, press them almost to suffocation, and strike them with a whip on his fist, on the head or face, while his passion lasted.’ (Rep. p. 15.) This was the penalty of not doing work enough; to save time for which, they were compelled to engage in school business during church hours on Sundays. In Stradbally, one little boy was flogged with a leathern strap, nine times in one day, suffering 100 lashes ‘for a sum in long division.’ In the same school, eight boys had been flogged till their backs were frightfully lacerated, because two of them had been looking at the policemen playing ball in an alley near the school. The master had three farms, and left the school to a brute of an usher, who thus conducted himself. Here, there were two head classes, containing twenty boys, thirteen years of age and upwards. Of these, seventeen had never heard of St. Paul; and they exhibited other proofs of ignorance equally astonishing. These are specimens of a system of education among a civilized people in the nineteenth century,

under the immediate control, management, and inspection of a body of men who oppose the present plan of national education, on the ground that without *their* exclusive superintendence it cannot be religious.

The commissioners remark, that they 'were particularly struck with the appearance of *sullenness and terror* which marked the deportment of the children in the school, contrasted with the free and lively air which generally characterizes those who are to be seen in day schools.' (p. 17.) No wonder! Tyranny has a power to corrupt the most ingenuous mind, to petrify all natural feeling.

In the immediate neighbourhood of these church seminaries, the commissioners found *pay* schools in cabins and stables, crowded with pupils, both protestant and Roman catholic, the parents of the latter refusing to send their children to the government schools, where they would be taught free. But things still more astonishing remain to be told. The clerical catechists were obliged to make a monthly return to the secretary in Dublin, of the state and progress of their respective schools. On this condition they took their situations, and received their salaries. But a report was rarely or never sent; nor did either the diocesan or the authorities in Dublin take pains to correct or punish this flagrant neglect of duty. The local committees were equally negligent, and when they did interfere, it was, not to protect fatherless children from cruelty, but to shelter their tormentors from punishment. For why should a loyal man be called to account by an Irish gentry, for scourging or starving an ill-conditioned imp of popery, whose vile blood rendered him incorrigible? Is it for this that they should deprive him of his vested rights—his freehold—and thereby expose the 'cause' to odium in the presence of the enemy? The very suggestion of such a thing many of them would account an insult.

There was no soundness in this system. It was everywhere corrupt. It was next to impossible that any complaint could reach the governors in Dublin. All the officials, even the secretary, were bribed by the masters, who purchased impunity by presents, loans of money without interest, &c. Hence all communications inculpating the latter were cushioned, or sent to the accused; in which case the boy, who had complained was publicly flogged as a warning to all others, and became ever after a special victim, the scape-goat of the school. The commissioners observe, that 'no offence which a charter-school child can commit seems to be less pardonable than daring to utter a complaint.' Notwithstanding, however, the difficulty of punishing delinquent masters, which was never done without legal proof, so enormous were the abuses of the system, that,

between 1800 and 1825, no less than thirty-two masters had been dismissed for misconduct from a total number of only thirty schools, and seventeen more resigned to avoid the same fate! The commissioners of 1812 spoke in favourable terms of the charter schools; but they had been completely deceived by the artful collusion and misrepresentation that prevailed, as the commissioners of 1824 prove by the number of disgraceful dismissals which occurred soon after, even in cases where they had bestowed special commendation.

According to the notions of some persons, who mistake the means for the end, and the letter for the spirit, these schools were 'scriptural.' The education, indeed, was chiefly 'religious.' There was the Church Catechism, and an exposition of it; there were controversial works against popery; and there was the Bible, thumbed and torn, as an unexplained task-book, till the mechanical toil generated a life-long aversion to that sacred book. There were no books of useful knowledge—nothing to teach the industrial arts of life. All these things were put away as so much profaneness. Mr. M'Ghee, an usher in one of the schools near Dublin, told the commissioners, as the result of his experience, that they were 'not schools of religion and industry, but quite the reverse.'

An intolerable odium attended the unhappy young persons brought up in these institutions. Few chose to take them as apprentices, though tempted with large fees. By their fellow-servants they were taunted as 'parisheens' and 'charter-school brats,' and were often obliged to shelter themselves from persecution by becoming spies and tale-bearers, or by escaping to strange places, where they might conceal the infamy of their education. For it has been said, that education itself was brought into contempt among the peasantry by those odious seminaries of proselytism. There were in them, in 1824, as many as 706 who had passed the age of apprenticeship, and could get no masters, and were maintained at great expense by the public, though there was a great demand for apprentices brought up in other schools. The masters, however, had an interest in retaining them, as they were paid for their board, and at the same time reaped the benefit of their labour. On this account they regularly gave a false account of their ages; the same boys being returned younger in 1824 than they had been in 1822, because they were expert weavers.

During nineteen years, this system cost the country 1,612,138*l.*, of which 1,027,715*l.* consisted of parliamentary grants. The total number apprenticed from the beginning till 1824 was only 12,745. Of these, but a small number received the portion of

5*l.* each, allotted to those who served out their apprenticeship and *married protestants*. A large proportion turned out badly. Thus 7905 of these spoiled children cost the public just one million sterling! In 1820, the grant was 24,000*l.* It was gradually reduced to 5750*l.* in 1832, when it was discontinued. The funds of the society are still considerable, but unequally distributed. The Athlone school is said to have 1748*l.*, while others have only 6*l.* per annum.

The impression produced on the catholic mind by such an institution as this, and the connexion of the Bible, as a school-book, with a system of such dishonesty, cruelty, rapacity, and impiety, was surely calculated to bring 'scriptural education,' so called, into very bad odour. Could the body who had maintained and fostered this system for so long a time, warring against honesty and humanity in the name of a purer Christianity—building religion on the ruins of natural affection and of a good conscience—could such a body be rationally trusted again with the education, at the public expense, not only of 'the children of the church,' but of six or seven millions beyond her pale?

We shall see that these persons were not more faithful in their stewardship where the education of the upper and middle classes was concerned; for which, also, ample provision had been made by the legislature. In the twelfth of Elizabeth, an act was passed for the establishment of *free-schools* in all the chief towns of the kingdom. This law required, that every school-master should be an 'Englishman, or of English birth in this realm,' (Ireland,) but nothing was said about religion, though the Act of Uniformity had been in force ten years. Hence originated the *diocesan-schools*. In the seventh of William III., they were denominated 'classical.' They were to be supported by a tax levied on ecclesiastical property, which the bishops paid tolerably well, the inferior clergy very badly. Several statutes were enacted on the subject during the last century; but the law was evaded, and the trust neglected, though placed, to a certain extent, under the control of the grand juries. Commissioners, in 1788, reported that from these institutions the public derived no 'adequate benefit. In many dioceses there were neither schools nor school-houses; in many more, the houses, lands, and masterships were nothing but sinecures. In the thirty-four dioceses they found only twenty diocesan schools. In 1809, the number had actually decreased, and the number of *free* scholars had diminished in still greater proportion. There were then only thirteen schools, ten only in tolerable repair, and the pupils numbered in all no more than 380.

In 1813, Sir R. Peel, then chief secretary of Ireland, brought in a bill by which, for the purposes of these schools, the thirty-four dioceses were consolidated into fifteen districts, in the hope of securing greater efficiency; yet, so late as 1830, five of these districts were without any school-houses.

There is nothing sectarian in the constitution of these schools, nothing to exclude dissenters or catholics from being masters. But the clergy monopolize all the offices, except that of usher—and even that has seldom, or never been given to any but a church protestant. They were certainly designed by the legislature to be open to all, and to afford ‘free’ education to many. The number of free scholars, however, has been always very small; and there has been a stigma affixed to them, for obvious reasons.

In addition to the parochial and diocesan schools, which should have been national schools, adequate to the wants of the country,—and which would have been so, had protestant churchmen been honest,—there was also placed under its control a number of academies, richly endowed, called *royal schools*. Of these there are seven; five having been founded by Charles I., in 1627, all in Ulster; and two more, in 1629, at Banagher and Carysfort, the latter a small hamlet in the county of Wicklow. The royal schools are by law open to all persuasions, the appointment of the master being lodged with the lord lieutenant, with the sole exception of Armagh; but no dissenter or catholic has ever obtained sufficient favour at the Castle to be so appointed. These schools, too, were and are among the innumerable good things reserved for the ecclesiastical benefit of the established clergy—the order of men, we regret to say, for whose sake so much national injustice has been perpetrated, and so much social discord created.

Here, too, exclusiveness has been attended by its usual curse of barrenness. Wherever it has prevailed, men have sown without increase; and still they have pursued the preposterous husbandry, not seeing that it is a soil on which Heaven bestows no blessing. The estates connected with the royal schools consist of 13,627 acres in the north of Ireland, the rents of which are well paid. The administration of these funds is vested in the archbishops and bishops, and the law gives them extensive powers for the due execution of their trust. In 1835, the property produced a rental of 6470*l*. As formerly managed, in the good old times of unquestioned ascendancy, when, in darkness and irresponsibility, everything connected with the ‘protestant interest’ was carried on for the behoof of bishops’ relatives, and an idle and spendthrift gentry, great abuses

prevailed in connexion with these schools. Leases were granted by the right reverend bench, to friends, at very low rents, and private families were enriched with the property of the public. In 1825, the income of the Armagh school, which should have been 1043*l.*, had been thus reduced to 461*l.*; and Dungannon, whose income should have been much larger, was plundered to the extent of 500*l.* or 600*l.* a year.

With all this property, designed to educate distinguished talent when found associated with poverty, the number of free scholars, or of exhibitions, in the university, has never been so considerable as to exercise any influence on the mind of the country. The church regarded it as its own private patrimony; and the catholic population, as part of her ample resources used for political and sectarian corruption. In 1782, there were in all the royal schools only thirty-eight free scholars; in 1835, notwithstanding the increase of the population, the growing demand for a superior education, the numerous parliamentary investigations, and the rising power of an enlightened public opinion, they had dwindled down to twenty-three!

Many of the masters, though deriving very large incomes from their schools, are also in the enjoyment of church livings. Dr. Millar, who presides over the Armagh school, or college, as it is called, is a rector besides, and a judge of the ecclesiastical court, rather too much work for one man, however learned and able he may be. Both the royal and the diocesan schools are regarded as seminaries for the sons of the protestant gentry, and nurseries for Trinity College. Their charges are as high as those of first-class private boarding-schools. The terms at Banagher are forty-five guineas, though the master, in addition to the house and grounds, has a fixed salary of 400*l.* a year. The Enniskillen master had in 1835 a salary of 500*l.* a year, and, in addition, fees amounting to 530*l.* for teaching fifty-eight scholars! He has also a splendid residence. The *average* charge in the royal schools is thirty-five guineas for boarders, and eight guineas for day scholars. There is no efficient control over these schools, there are no local committees, no adequate superintendence. The buildings are now generally good. The college at Armagh cost 5800*l.*, and at Enniskillen 3000*l.* It is but just to say here, that at present the bishops of the Irish church are exceedingly vigilant, and lose no opportunity of building up the walls of their Zion.—(See Parliamentary Reports on Irish Academical Education, 1835-6, and vol. vii. No. 701.)

Never were clergy so laden with educational responsibilities, and at the same time so eager to increase the burden. The state was sufficiently bountiful of funds for the instruction of the people; but the exclusive channel through which its bounty

flowed, or rather, the cistern where it stagnated, converted the blessing into a pestilence. There were several institutions, strictly protestant, which, though more restricted in their objects, were endowed with public money, or large private bequests. These, too, were all committed to the religious superintendence of the established church, and were made subservient to the increase of her congregations, by imparting an exclusively protestant education. Of the management of these, it is enough to say, that when it came to light, public opinion constrained the parliament to withhold its grants. Of this class were the *Foundling Hospital*, the *Hibernian School* for soldiers' children, which, up to 1826, had received grants to the amount of 240,356*l.*; the *Marine School*, for the children of 'decayed seamen,' which, in 1835, enjoyed an income of 900*l.* for the education of twenty-three children; the *Blue-Coat Hospital*, connected with the Dublin corporation, where each boy costs 24*l.* a year.

Erasmus Smith's Schools, now eighty-nine in number, containing 11,000 children of all denominations, were founded under a charter of Charles II. in 1669, by the gentleman whose name they bear, for the education of his own tenantry, and other poor persons. The endowment amounted in 1835 to 7584*l.* The masters are generally, though not exclusively, protestant. Besides these, there are many schools sustained by private endowments in different parts of the country, which had among them, in 1788, property to the amount of 7400*l.* per annum, and it has been since much increased.

These and all other 'charity schools,' no matter to what church they belong, are more or less mismanaged for want of public oversight; and it is not easy to see how this can be secured without placing them under the Board of Irish Education, or some other authority adequate to the work of inspection. The present practical *irresponsibility* and *privacy* should be brought to an end. In Ireland, all endowments, both public and private, have worked badly, chiefly because they were under the control of one small exclusive party, who never honestly wished to enlighten and elevate the great body of the people, but—instinctively dreading their political influence—were ever anxious to keep them down. A functionary of this party would meet a public-spirited educationist with words like these:—'What! do you want to make these people discontented with their lot, and clever at sedition? Or would you enable young men of talent among them to start up and occupy the situations filled by us, who have a natural right to them,—and who already find them far too few?'

Among the protestant opponents of the just and liberal system

which has now obtained a firm and permanent footing in Ireland, and whose triumphs hitherto have been those of reason and justice over ignorance, bigotry, and party spirit, there are some conscientious men of considerable influence who assert that the national system has superseded societies which gave to the Irish poor more and better education than they are now receiving. Convinced that this opinion is not supported by facts, and that it may lead to serious mistakes, we must beg the reader's attention to a brief notice of the societies in question:—

1. *The Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Knowledge of the Christian Religion* was founded in 1792, and originated in a dread of French democracy and infidelity. Its members first devoted themselves to the circulation of Bibles, prayer-books, and catechisms; but afterwards schools for the poor were embraced within the sphere of their operations. This was from the beginning strictly a church society; the masters and mistresses must be members of the establishment, appointed by the incumbent; the Bible must be read by all who had attained sufficient proficiency, and the catechism learned as part of the school business, by the children of the church. The schools were supported partly by subscriptions, and partly by public grants. The report of 1828 states, that the total amount voted by parliament, from 1800 to 1827, (when the grant was withdrawn,) was 101,991*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.*

It is true, that owing to the influence of landlords, the great want of tolerable schools, and other circumstances, a considerable number of Roman-catholic children crept stealthily to some of these schools. But this was in many, perhaps most cases, the effect of a compromise made privately by the master, and unknown to the inspectors and visitors, or winked at by them, though violating one of the rules. The schools of the association amounted in 1824 to 226, and the number of children to 12,769; of which it was stated, that 7803 were protestants, and 4804 Roman catholics. This was a small number for a population of six millions. But the Rev. Mr. Lee, who had inspected 104 of these schools in 1819 and 1820, stated before the commissioners in 1824, that he had found the catechism of the church of Rome in many of them. This fact accounts for the attendance of even the small number of Roman catholics reported. As another proof of the immoral tendencies of exclusiveness, it may be mentioned, that fifty-two masters were dismissed from these schools in the course of five years.

2. Next in the order of time comes the *London Hibernian Society*, founded in 1806 on the catholic principle, by Christian men of great benevolence, and with the best feelings towards

the people of Ireland; but many of them were ignorant of the circumstances and history of the country—and as their object, though disavowed in words, was the destruction of the church of Rome in Ireland, and as this object was pursued with a certain kind of secrecy, and by holding out various inducements to the cupidity of the unprincipled, they were obliged to work with agencies that were not always trustworthy. The reading of the Bible was enforced, but all catechisms and works of controversy were excluded. The parish clergyman was an *ex officio* visitor, but other ministers were not excluded. The school books were ill adapted for their purpose, from the absurd rule to insert in them no words not found in the Bible. The very object sought by this was completely defeated, for in every difficult word in the Bible, the reader recognised an old enemy which had tortured him in the perplexing and ill-arranged columns of his spelling-book. The scriptures were committed to memory, and as the progress of the children was estimated and rewarded according to the number of verses they could repeat, the memory was worked to excess at the expense of the judgment and the conscience. The master being paid according to the number of the pupils, led to great frauds. Roman-catholic children were charitably *lent* in scores to ‘enter an appearance’ on the day of inspection; and to those who attended constantly, their catechism was taught contrary to a fundamental rule. Some years since, these frauds were exposed in the *Church of Ireland Magazine*, where the society was charged with reporting long columns of ‘boys in buckram.’

This society became by degrees more episcopal and conservative, till at length, it found it advantageous to separate itself from dissenters altogether. It is now, we believe, merged in the Church Education Society. It has been the constant practice of its orators, of late years, to assail and calumniate the Board of Education. Indeed, it has been always decidedly anti-liberal in its spirit. It received some public money, owing to the connexion of many of its schools with the Kildare-Place Society; and also directly, if we mistake not, from the *Lord Lieutenant's Fund*.

It is absurd to suppose that educational societies like these—coming in the train of the tainted charter-school system, with similar principles and purposes, though guided by a far more Christian spirit—were competent to educate the catholic poor of Ireland. Is it credible that the people would freely allow their children to be trained up by strangers, in hatred of the religion for which their fathers had suffered the loss of all things, and in the principles of a church in whose name so much

social injustice had been inflicted? No—the vast majority preferred paying for education, such as it was, in the hedge schools which abounded in the country. It may be said, and in many cases truly said, that they would receive a protestant education for their children if not prevented by their clergy. But so long as it is a principle of their faith to obey those clergy, and of your law to tolerate them, what do you gain by treating catholic subjects as slaves without conscience? Is it not far better, by a good general education, and free institutions, to prepare the people themselves to assert a manly independence? Why keep meanly and tortuously hankering after a principle of government which is utterly impracticable, and has been for ever abandoned by the legislature? You can no longer subvert popery by a tax on papists. Neither can you do it by voluntary or ‘charity’ schools, which tamper with conscience, and generate a mean and *pauper* spirit. Education is the subjects’ birthright, and not a thing to be sold on the condition of religious conformity or political time-serving.

This fact was strongly felt by the commissioners who issued their last Report in 1812. Then two archbishops, one bishop, and the provost of the university, joined in announcing the great principle, that the government should establish ‘a general plan of education for the lower classes, keeping clear of all interference with the religious tenets of any, and thereby inducing the whole to receive education as *one body*, under one and the same system, and in the same establishment.’ This they regard as of essential importance, and add—‘We venture to express our unanimous opinion, that no such plan, however wisely and unexceptionably continued in other respects, can be carried into effectual execution in this country, unless it be explicitly avowed and clearly understood, as its *leading principle*, that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians.’

The government, having found some difficulty in establishing a system upon the liberal principle, thus emphatically recommend so early as 1812, determined on making an experiment of it by giving a sum of money to a voluntary society then existing in the *Liberty*, Dublin, and afterwards, from the locality of its offices and model schools, called the *Kildare-Place Society*. It was founded in 1811, and received its first grant, 6980*l.*, in 1814. Its objects were, to assist schools with grants, to establish model schools, to publish useful books, to supply school requisites at cost prices, to keep up an annual inspection, and to encourage masters by gratuities. All religious teaching was utterly excluded; but the Bible, without note or comment, was required to

be read as a school book by the upper classes. This society accomplished much good. It was the first practical step towards a sound and useful education in Ireland. Its school books alone should entitle it to the lasting gratitude of the country.

Several causes combined to produce the opposition which proved fatal to it as a national institution, nearly all, however, being brought into operation by departures from its own principle of religious neutrality. The general committee, or ruling body, was rather exclusive in its composition. In 1825, it consisted of twenty-one episcopalians, four quakers, two presbyterians, and *only two Roman catholics*. It was rendered obnoxious by its aiding the schools of the two proselyting societies we have referred to, which Roman catholics considered a misapplication of funds to which they were themselves contributors. In many cases, local patrons indiscreetly violated the rules by controversial expositions of the Bible in the presence of Roman-catholic children. Add to these causes the great political excitement which preceded the passing of the catholic relief bill. The opponents of that measure appealed to the success of the Kildare-place Schools in protestantizing the country, adducing the catholic 'Bible readers,' as a proof that no change was necessary. This brought against the society a torrent of political agitation. The schools were denounced from the altars, and those who did not withdraw their children were, in some instances, refused the sacraments.

It must be candidly admitted that there were solid grounds of complaint against the practices of the society. The Commissioners' Report for 1825, (p. 58,) states that—

'Compliance with the three fundamental rules is, in many places, merely nominal; the use of the Scriptures is frequently a matter of form; *catechisms* are taught as freely in many of their schools as in any others, merely by the fiction of treating the appointed times as not being school hours; and the selection of masters and mistresses, though nominally influenced by religious considerations, are truly and practically confined to Roman catholics, when the patrons are the Roman-catholic clergy, and to protestants, when the schools are in connexion with the association for discountenancing vice, or the patrons are the clergy of the established church.'

Mr. (now lord) Stanley stated in parliament, (9th Sept., 1831,) that there were 1021 of the schools in the protestant province of Ulster, and only 600 in the other three provinces; and that of 204 teachers trained that year in the model school only 33 were Roman catholics. Thus, while the Roman catholics were 6 to 1 of the protestants, and if you count

only the *poor* on both sides, 20 to 1, their teachers trained in this national institution were only 1 to 6. How could a system so partially administered give general satisfaction?

The present commissioners justly remark in their Eleventh Report (1844) that the system of the Kildare-place Society—

‘Was manifestly the same as that which was formerly called the Lancasterian system in England, and which, although adopted by the great body of the protestant dissenters there, was so much opposed by the bishops and clergy of the established church in general that they completely prevented its application to the schools for the children of their communion. The Roman-catholic prelates and clergy set themselves with equal resolution against it in Ireland, and with equal success.

‘It was accordingly found, in 1824, that of 400,348 children whose parents *paid* for their education in the general schools of the country, and whose religion was ascertained, there were 81,201 protestants, and 319,228 Roman catholics; while of 56,201 children educated under the Kildare-place Society, although *theirs* were schools for the *poor*, and the Roman catholics bear a much greater proportion to protestants in the poorer classes than in the higher, there were 26,237 protestants, and only 29,964 Roman catholics!’

In other words, the children of the catholic millions were little more than the children of the protestant thousands in the government schools, but in the schools where education was *paid for*, they were nearly four to one! Now compare this state of things with what soon took place under the present system. It appears from a Report published in 1826, by the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, that the number of children returned to them as attending in schools to which the state granted aid, was 69,638, and the grants for education in the preceding year amounted to 66,718*l.*; whereas the number of children under the present board in 1838, when their grant was only 50,000*l.*, amounted to 169,000; 100,000 children more being educated for 18,000*l.* less!

It is said, indeed, by the opponents of state education under any circumstances, that it was the parliamentary grant that led to the failure of the Kildare-place Society, and that but for this it would have been completely successful. We are at a loss to know by what divination this is made out. The grant, and the control of public opinion which it entailed, were the chief inducements with the Roman-catholic clergy to sanction it so far as they did. Then it should be recollected that the society was formed in 1811, and received the first grant in 1814. It could not have accomplished any great wonders in two or three years; and if it started as an enthusiastic voluntary, it very soon grew tired or distrustful of its principle. It failed, because it required

the great bulk of the population for whose benefit it was designed—namely, ‘the poor of Ireland,’—to violate a fundamental principle of their church in order to receive its advantages.

We are strongly of opinion that much has been absurdly and perversely said on the advantage of *enforcing* Bible reading as a *school exercise*. When the Bible is taught to the young, it ought to be taught thoroughly and *doctrinally*, and not as a dry verbal task for the memory, associated, perhaps, with ideas of confinement, toil, and punishment, which frequently create an aversion to that sacred book, not easily removed in after-life. It is not amidst the hurry, impatience, emulation, and levity of the school hour, and under the rod of the master, that the solemn truths of Revelation are best impressed on the human heart. They are far better learned at the domestic altar, in the Sunday school, and the congregation.

On this point we cannot have better evidence than that of Mr. Veevers, who was superintendent of the Kildare-place model schools in Dublin. ‘Unless experience be a cheat, and fact a lie,’ this testimony should go far to dispose some minds to a profitable thoughtfulness on this subject. To the commissioners in 1824 that intelligent gentleman returned the following answers, (Report, App. No. 207, p. 472.):—

‘Are the Scriptures in any way *explained* to the children in the school-room?—*Never*.

‘Is it your opinion that the *more advanced* boys understand tolerably the meaning of the New Testament when reading it?—*I am of opinion that they do not*.

‘The question does not refer, of course, merely to the doctrinal parts of the New Testament; but do you conceive they understand the ordinary parts of the New Testament?—*I think they do not*.

‘Do they manifest any curiosity upon the subject; any wish to be better informed about it?—*I do not recollect an instance of it*.’

Such was the ‘scriptural education’ of the Kildare-place model schools. A system was demanded by public opinion, from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism; which should be subject to a direct responsibility and vigorous superintendence; which should respect the civil right of parents to determine the sort of religious education their children should receive, and which should treat the members of all churches and sects with perfect equality; which should check the centralizing, or slumbering, or corrupting tendencies of government by the authority of local committees, the stimulus of local subscriptions, and the jealous inspection of rival pastors, and should honestly educate the whole people as one united civil community.

Such a system is now prosperously working under the commissioners of National Education in Ireland. The determination of the former Whig government, in regard to it, was conveyed by Lord (then Mr.) Stanley, in his letter to the duke of Leinster, dated October, 1831. The first commissioners were the duke of Leinster, archbishop Whately, archbishop Murray, the Rev. Dr. Sadlier, Rev. James Carlile (presbyterian), A. R. Blake (chief remembrancer, a Roman catholic), and Robert Holmes, a Unitarian barrister of the highest eminence in his profession, and a man of known independence. Mr. Carlile, minister of Mary's-alley congregation in Dublin, was the only paid commissioner, and to him, during seven years, was committed a principal share in working the system. He selected the scripture lessons, directed the compilation of the school books, obtained the recognition of parental rights, apart from clerical authority; and, in fact, did more than all other men to arrange the machinery and put it in working order.

Much opposition was excited by the part of Lord Stanley's letter which spoke of '*encouraging*' the clergy to give religious instruction, and requiring the attendance of the scholars at their respective places of worship on Sunday to be *registered* by the schoolmaster. This was unwarrantably trenching on religious ground, and committing both Protestants and Catholics to the active support of what they mutually deemed false. But the government were driven to this course by the cry of 'infidelity,' and 'atheism,' which the new plan encountered, as soon as it was proposed in parliament. Explanations were afterwards issued by authority, showing that the 'encouragement' of religious instruction meant only granting 'facility of access' to the children out of school hours, not 'employing or remunerating' the teachers. The commissioners very properly treated the Bible as a book for religious instruction; but so far from offering the sacred volume an 'indignity,' or 'forbidding' it; they say: 'To the religious instructors of the children they cheerfully leave, in communicating instruction, the use of the sacred volume itself, as containing those doctrines and precepts, a knowledge of which must be at the foundation of all true religion.' (Preface to Scripture Lessons.)

In fact, the Holy Scriptures *may* be read *and expounded* in every one of the national schools, and are read daily in a great many of them. All that is required is, that the exercise shall

* See his excellent speech on "Justice to Ireland in Spiritual Things," addressed to the Free Church Assembly, and recently published in Dublin.

not interfere with the general school business, or be forced on Roman catholics. There was a great deal of absurd and wicked declamation about 'robbing the children of the Bible,' 'burking the Bible,' and so forth; and 'the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,' was a fanatical war-cry at the hustings, and other places of political agitation, raised by men whose consciences meekly endured an enormous burden of human impositions by which the word of God is supplemented and over-ridden, where it ought to reign alone. These men affected to be terror-struck that any regulation should be made for the direction of school business, by which any child should be prevented, at *any hour or moment*, from standing up before his master, and boldly asserting his inalienable right to read the Bible; though in conducting their own business in life, they are daily and hourly consulting expediency, making compromises, adjusting compensations, balancing difficulties and inconveniences—not doing what is best in the abstract, but what is best, on the whole, under existing circumstances. If one of their own apprentices, or shopmen, or labourers, should stop short in the midst of his work while the machinery was going, or customers were waiting, and opening his Bible, solemnly claim his infeasible right to read the Word of God *whenever he pleased*, would these gentlemen deem *that* a natural mode of carrying out their own sacred principle? We trow not!

But to obviate every cavil, as far as possible, without departing from the fundamental principle of the Board, it was arranged that the Bible might be read at *any* hour of the day, provided the time was distinctly specified, so that there should be no suspicion of a desire to take advantage of the presence of Roman catholics. This satisfied the presbyterians, who have nearly all placed their schools in connexion with the board. But the great body of the established clergy continued and still continue hostile, having put forth *The Church Education Society* as a rival candidate for parliamentary recognition and support. Its committee declare that the national system is 'essentially defective' in *permitting* the catholic children to refuse the Bible. They say this permission 'involves a practical indignity to the Word of God,' and that it is 'carrying into effect the discipline of the church of Rome, in restricting the use of the inspired writings.' This is the grand charge against the board—the vital point of the controversy.

The commissioners meet it somewhat in the following manner:—If it be an essential defect to 'permit' persons to refuse to read the Bible, the defect is in the *law*—in that religious

‘freedom which the law has established—in that right which the law gives to parents of all communions to have their children instructed in religion according to the principles of their own church, and not according to those of another. To object to a system which *permits* parents to do what the law gives them a *right* to do, is clearly to object rather to the law than to the ‘system.’ If *not* to *force* children to read the Bible is to offer it an indignity, then the Church Education Society offers the Prayer-book an indignity in *permitting* Roman catholics and dissenters, in their own schools, to refuse instruction therein.

‘Again, if *not* to enforce the reading of the Scriptures be to enforce the discipline of the Roman-catholic church, which restricts the use of them, then *not* to enforce the formularies of the established church is to enforce that principle of dissent which rejects these altogether; and this, we presume, the committee would no more undertake to do than to enforce the discipline of the church of Rome.’

‘We believe,’ (add the commissioners in the same Report, in whose composition and logic we cannot but recognise the pen of Archbishop Whately, whose genius, influence, and firmness have done so much to give stability to the system)—‘we believe that a system which encourages an union of protestant and Roman-catholic children in the same schools, for such an education as may fit them for those civil duties which they are in after-life to perform together, separating them only for instruction in those religious duties which they have to perform separately, is the education best calculated to teach them, by lessons both of precept and habit, that *religious differences* should not prevent *civil concord*; and that whatever these differences may be, the great principle of Christian charity should bind them to each other, particularly as members of the same civil community, by feelings of attachment and good will.’ (Ninth Report, 1842.)

There never was anything more outrageously factious than the cry of irreligion raised by extreme parties on both sides against the Irish National Schools. True, the board do not *compel* the reading of the Bible; but we have yet to learn that there is anything peculiarly religious in such compulsion. Surely, the experience of the last hundred years should have taught the most besotted bigotry the folly as well as the wickedness of such a course. But freedom has effected what force could never accomplish. While no class of Christians are involved in responsibility for the teaching of any other body, the Holy Scriptures are extensively used. In 1843, they were read in 944 schools. *The Scripture Extracts*, (never designed as a substitute for the Bible, but as introduction to it,) though not enforced, were read the same year in 1307 schools. These

extracts contain the great leading truths of the gospel set forth in the words of Scripture so fully, that the willing reader of them can hardly fail to understand its leading doctrines, and have his mind insensibly imbued with an evangelical spirit. Independently, however, of these, we do not hesitate to say, that the general reading books issued by the board, and studied by the scholars universally, so far from inculcating irreligion and requiring counteraction, are fitted, from the large amount of scriptural truth which they contain, and their admirable adaptation to the minds of youth, to impart more of really Christian sentiment, and to better practical purpose, than much of the professedly religious teaching which prevails in protestant schools.

Although the *appointment and removal of teachers* properly rests with the local committees and patrons of schools, the greatest care is taken to secure that they shall be men intellectually and morally qualified for their work, blameless in their character, and Christian in their spirit. While in the Training school in Dublin, a vigilant superintendence is exercised over their conduct; and they receive special religious instruction from their respective pastors. All the masters are strictly forbidden to attend fairs, markets, or political meetings. The schools are always open to public observation; and there are thirty-two superintendents appointed for the work of inspection, all kept on the alert by the vigilance of the commissioners, who seem to perform their responsible duties with impartiality, zeal, firmness, and wisdom. Such management of public funds—such governmental power, combined with public spirit, and a scrupulous regard to the rights of conscience, is truly a new thing in Ireland. We are not afraid that, in these times, public opinion will allow these functionaries to sleep at their post; and we think there are in this system, or, if not, there may readily be, constitutional checks enough to prevent any serious abuse of their powers. We are not a little grieved when we find attacks upon it proceeding from English dissenters: they are ungracious; they seem to convict us of inconsistency, and to bring into question our attachment to civil and religious liberty.

It has been long objected against the national schools, that they do not really give a united education, but are really more sectarian than any that has hitherto existed in Ireland. It is admitted by the parties who make this objection, that the principle and design of the board is to bring the children of all persuasions to receive their literary training together; on the same common ground, where none can claim superiority, and none dare boast of ascendancy, where the child of the methodist, independent, baptist, or covenanter, shall have as much right to take his

place, and to have his creed respected, as the child of the catholic, the episcopalian, or presbyterian, and where protestant and catholic stand on an equal footing. The wisest men of all churches, who had thought much about Ireland, have often declared this to be a consummation to be earnestly desired. The Board has endeavoured to accomplish it, but, in some cases, owing to the conduct of other parties, whom it could not control, the object has not been fully gained; and then these obstructing parties have turned round, and cast on the system the blame of their own work! They maligned the government plan—they excited the popular passions against it—they declined to co-operate, or visit, or in any way to aid in keeping the system free from sectarian influences,—they refused sites on common ground,—they set up rival schools, and had recourse to all sorts of arts to fill them;—and having so done, they turn round and triumphantly exclaim—‘ See, there is no mixed education in the national schools! The children are all catholics or presbyterians, and the schools are close to the chapels and meeting-houses.’

Now, it is a fact, that a considerable number of the school-houses are situated near places of worship. One cause of this undesirable state of things we have just intimated, namely, the refusal of sites by Conservative landlords. Is the board to be blamed for that?—As well might the site-refusing landlords of Scotland taunt the free church with failure, because they have forced its zealous adherents to build in inconvenient localities. Besides, the neighbourhood of a place of worship is often the most suitable place in which a school could be erected, for it is generally the centre of a populous district, or the point where several roads converge, to which there is most easy access from all parts of the district. Nor do we think that in these utilitarian times the *genus loci* will overcome the principle of equal rights for all, which the national system everywhere inculcates. It should be stated that the inspectors of the national schools are obliged to visit them occasionally *without any notice*; and that whenever a breach of the rules is detected, the abuse must be corrected, or the school will be disannexed.

Another objection, made somewhat in the same spirit, and by the same parties, is, that the new system is ‘a vast national machinery for forcing the children of Roman catholics under popish instruction, binding them over to the priests for life,—a new endowment of Romanism at the expense of protestants, &c. All this, it seems, is accomplished by allowing the priests the use of the school-houses to catechise their children. Now, it is true that the school-houses are partly built by public money; but then

the local parties must contribute one-third of the expense; and for this reason they do not think it unjust that the house should be open to catholics or protestants for the religious instruction of the children, especially as such occupation of it must not interfere with the regular school business, *for which alone the public pays.*

It is further said, that, but for these schools, the children of Roman catholics would be left by their clergy to protestant training! We have said enough already to show the folly of such a notion. Are the priests, indeed, so powerless with the poor peasantry, that they cannot collect their children to teach them, unless the English government shall assist them in doing so. Are they dependent on the national schools for accommodation to instruct the young? Have they not one, two, three, or four chapels in every parish completely at their disposal? Can they not, any Sunday, name the house of a farmer in any locality in which to meet the children of a district, and would not he and they be perfectly welcome? Have not Sunday schools been for many years carried on by the catholics of Ireland with the utmost assiduity, and are there not many thousands of young persons among them, of both sexes, who count it a most meritorious work to instruct children in "the Christian doctrine"? Persons who make this objection, are persons who know little of Ireland, or who are not disposed to make a just report concerning it. The truth is, that all catholic children who can be possibly reached by any religious influence are carefully prepared for confirmation and communion, however destitute they may be of secular instruction.

Do protestants think it a worse thing that Roman-catholic children should attend these schools, where the most objectionable peculiarities of their religion are daily counteracted by a sound and liberal education, which develops the intellectual and moral faculties, and teaches *toleration and charity*, as its first and great lesson,—than to be left to monks, and other chance teachers, or to blank ignorance and the lowest barbarism, as is the case in Connaught, wherever Dr. McHale's influence prevails? The complaints of this ignorance as leading to crime, which were made by two liberal judges, one of them a Roman catholic, on the Connaught circuit at the last summer assizes, should have taught such objectors a different lesson. These learned persons, in their addresses to the juries, ascribed the gross ignorance and barbarous crimes that so frequently came before them in that part of the country, to the absence of national schools. This testimony in favour of these institutions may well outweigh whole columns of ingenious misrepresentation. The safety and

well-being of society demand the removal of popular ignorance, and make it the duty of government to aid in the removal of that ignorance.

Dr. McHale has obtained praise in quarters where something different might have been expected, as giving proof of high-minded principle and honourable consistency in opposing the national schools. But strange things do sometimes pass under the name of principle. There was a time when Dr. McHale saw so little wrong in the government plan of united education, that he applied for a large supply of money to fit up an old chapel for a national school, which the board did not feel at liberty to grant. At Dr. McHale's dictation, the clergy under his control immediately withdrew from their connexion with the board. 'When they knew the system only as a theory, they embraced it as a means of good,' (say the commissioners, Sixth Report, 1839,) 'and now after having had experience of it for years, they neither state that it has disappointed them in practice, nor that it has proved in any degree injurious or inconvenient, yet they have come to the opinion—assigning no reason whatever for having done so—that it can never enjoy the confidence of the Irish people.' One body of Dr. McHale's clergy did assign a reason,—which was, that the board were guilty of abuses in the allocation of their funds, by which they meant of course that Connaught did not obtain its due, whereas it had received more money for building than the more populous provinces of Ulster or Munster—the sum allocated there, up to January, 1839, being 10,824*l*. We are sorry that we cannot rank ourselves among the protestant admirers of Dr. McHale's lofty principles. Supposing him, however, to be now sincere in his opposition, that fact would be the clearest proof that the national schools do not propagate Romanism to such an alarming extent as some people pretend. We think that Dr. McHale is sincere now, whatever he may have been formerly; that, like *some* protestant prelates, he acts from that feeling in his order, which disposes them to look with special dread on everything like a liberal system of popular education.

The strangest objection of all brought against the new system is, that it has superseded the *hedge schools*; with their really united education and a race of schoolmasters, compared with whom the *élèves* of the national board are very small persons. It is natural that imaginative minds should see even the hedge teachers through the magnifying haze of antiquity, and be capable of venerating them as the *fathers* of the scholastic sect. Yet, with some noble exceptions, in which we find genius, and

learning, and virtue happily combined, we do not see much to regret in the extinction of the power of such instructors over the youthful mind of Ireland. They were in many cases the secretaries of illegal societies, the scribes of sedition, the fomentors of disloyalty. Disabled or distorted in body, perverse in temper,—uncultivated in mind and manners,—or disappointed candidates for the clerical office, often intemperate and disorderly in their habits, the majority of them being men who were far indeed from exerting a happy influence over young minds. Of *education*, in the large and proper sense of that term, they knew little or nothing. If they had, they could never have tolerated the sort of books generally used in their schools.

In the fourteenth report of the first commissioners of Irish education, published in 1812, it is stated that the estimated number of schools in the country at that time was 4600, and of scholars, 200,000. The commissioners thus speak of the character of the education which then prevailed :

‘The poverty of the lower classes of the people, while it limits the recompence of the masters to the low rates above-mentioned, and thus holds out no temptation to a higher class to undertake the office of instruction, made its effect, if possible, still worse, by incapacitating them from purchasing such books as are fit for children to read; whence it frequently happens that instead of being improved by moral and religious instruction, their minds are corrupted by books calculated to incite to lawless and profligate adventure, to cherish superstition, or to lead to dissension or disloyalty.’

Setting aside some religious books, not the best adapted for the mind of youth, the reading lessons for both sexes often consisted in tales of fairies, lives of robbers, adventures of rakes, and such like pernicious publications.

In a list of books returned by clergymen to the commissioners of education, in 1825, (Report, p. 43,) as being actually used in schools in their parishes, we select the following:—The Garden of Love—The Feast of Love—The Effects of Love—The Economy of Beauty—The School of Delights—Nocturnal Revels—The Life of Moll Flanders—Rousseau’s *Eloisa*—The Pleasant Art of Money-catching—The Devil and Dr. Faustus—Tristram Shandy—Pastorini, Prophecies, &c. &c. Each scholar brought whatever book he could pick up, from pedlars and hawkers, and as they all ‘rehearsed’ at the top of their voices, at the same time, our hedge school chorus must have been often not a little after the Babel fashion! One of the commissioners, in 1824, saw, in a school in the county of Sligo, a child

holding a New Testament; sitting between two others, one of whom was supplied with The Forty Thieves, and the other, The Pleasant Art of Money-catching, while another, at a little distance, was perusing The Mutiny Act, and all reading aloud their respective volumes at the same moment (Report, p. 44.)

It may be said, perhaps, that this state of things belonged only to some very wild districts of the south and west. But it was far otherwise. In Ulster, where there was a respectable middle class, where the linen trade caused a brisk circulation of money, and where the demands of business made the need of learning greater, we find that the then system—or rather no system—did nothing effectual for education; and, judging from the state of the districts still left to the same means, we have not the least reason to expect any material improvement. The fact is, the schoolmasters of Ulster were starved into submission to the board; for while the Orangemen shouted, ‘No surrender,’ they paid little attention to the commissariat! The same process is now going on in Connaught, under the shadow of Dr. Mellale, where the national schools are wisely winked at by the priests.

But to return to the pay schools of Ulster. According to the testimony of Dr. Cooke, of Belfast, as given before the Commissioners of 1824, the books in use in those schools were scarcely a shade better than those mentioned as the favourites in hedge schools. (Appendix No. 261, p. 820.) It is true that protestants and catholics united in these schools, and the master taught the contradictory creeds without scruple, and when aided by one or two of the senior students in ‘giving out the catechism,’ the catholics, episcopalians, and presbyterians, ranged in their respective places, parroted their answers at the same time, all standing up, and eager to get through the edifying process. Such latitudinarianism on the part of a hedge schoolmaster is lauded as a beautiful exemplification of united education, by the very men who condemn the government for giving equal countenance to all creeds. And it is for the sake of such schools, and of a principle producing such fruits, that the Independents and Baptists of England are invoked to put down the national system now established in Ireland. We have a strong impression that such appeals will be made in vain. The bodies referred to are not likely to stultify themselves by any such proceeding. In the *History of the Baptist Irish Society*, whose schools have been greatly reduced by those of the National Board, the following magnanimous testimony is borne to the efficiency of the rival institutions; we quote it with sincere pleasure, as most honourable to the parties concerned:

‘The other and more extensive cause of diminution is one which cannot be contemplated without feelings of the highest satisfaction, and is thus adverted to by a deputation sent by the society in 1837. ‘From all that the deputation saw of several of the national schools, they could not but regard them as a means of diffusing light, *more powerful than any other in existence*. We are not of the number who would dissociate religion from national instruction, and this is not done in these institutions. Hundreds of thousands of Roman-catholic children, who would have grown up in entire ignorance of the word of God, are brought to know much important truth by the extracts they use; and the operations of mind in Ireland must be different from those in all other countries, if by knowing a portion of what is found salutary, inquiry is not excited after what remains to be known. A part of the Bible, read and understood, will lead to inquiry after other parts of it, so that a vast change in the moral circumstances of the country is, we think, at no great distance.’ They add, that the national schools are— ‘*Noble institutions, which afford as much facility for evangelical instruction as, under the circumstances of the case, could possibly be looked for.*’—(pp. 50, 51.)

It should be known that the position of the old Irish schoolmasters was very humiliating and even degrading. They had, in many cases, no home, no certain dwelling-place, but were compelled to seek lodging among their pupils. By the churlish and selfish they were uninvited and unwelcomed; hence they were thrown on a few hospitable families, so frequently as to become a burden. This must have sadly lowered their authority in the school, and placed them, in fact, very much in the power of their scholars. Besides, it was with the utmost difficulty they collected the miserable sums which they earned, from the parents, who paid for education with proverbial reluctance. Nothing of late has more astonished us than the suggestion that this system should be revived! The national schoolmasters are not adequately paid—and here lies the great defect of the system; but assuredly they are in a much better condition than any race of peasant school-teachers that have gone before them in Ireland.

So far, the system has been completely successful. Last year the number of schools was 3426, and the number of children in attendance upon them 432,844. The commissioners had promised grants to 276 schools more. In addition to the vast number of children receiving a sound education, no less than ninety poor law unions have placed their schools in connexion with this board. This is an important fact, showing the hold the system has on the influential opinion of the country. For the boards of guardians, comprising protestants and Roman catholics, have

among them men of the highest rank and station, and in their schools the great principle of the board is carried into complete effect. The following table, extracted from the last Report, shows the progress of the system, in despite of the opposition made to it from its commencement to the present time :

TABLE showing the progressive Increase in the NATIONAL SCHOOLS, and the NUMBER OF CHILDREN in attendance upon them, from the date of the First Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, to the 31st December, 1845.

No. and Date of Report.	No. of Schools in operation.	No. of Children on the Rolls.
No. 1, 31st December, 1833	789	107,042
No. 2, 31st March, 1835	1,106	145,521
No. 3, do. 1836	1,181	153,707
No. 4, do. 1837	1,300	166,929
No. 5, do. 1838	1,384	169,548
No. 6, 31st December, 1839	1,581	192,971
No. 7, do. 1840	1,978	232,560
No. 8, do. 1841	2,337	281,849
No. 9, do. 1842	2,721	319,792
No. 10, do. 1843	2,912	355,320
No. 11, do. 1844	3,153	395,550
No. 12, do. 1845	3,426	432,844

MAURICE CROSS, }
JAMES KELLY, } Secretaries.

In 1844, the Board obtained their *Charter of Incorporation*, granted to Richard, Archbishop of Dublin; the Most Rev. Archbishop Daniel Murray; Franc Sadlier, D.D., Provost, T.C.D.; Right Hon. A. R. Blake; Robert Holmes, Esq., Barrister-at-Law; Sir Patrick Bellew, Bart.; R. W. Greene, (then) Solicitor-general; P. S. Henry, D.D., President of Queen's College, Belfast; Alexander McDonnell, Esq.; the Marquis of Kildare, (son of the duke of Leinster.)

During the year they trained in their schools in Dublin 260 teachers—of whom, 173 were males, and 87 were females. About one-fourth of the number were protestants. They have besides trained a number of others for schools not national; and they have now in training, at the public expense, 165 teachers. There are in operation five agricultural model schools, and the Board have undertaken to make grants to five more. There are,

besides, seven ordinary schools which have land attached to them, and in which the pupils are instructed in the science of agriculture.

Bearing in mind the circumstances of Ireland, and the fact that civilization has never made any considerable progress in the absence of trade and commerce, we think it highly desirable that the national schools should assume more of an industrial character; and that some of the children should be taught useful handicrafts, at least, in those districts where the raw materials for domestic manufactures are most abundant. After all, the greatest want of Ireland is industrial education. It is on many accounts important that productive employment, requiring habits of order and industry, should be associated with agricultural pursuits. To this association the Belgian peasantry owe much of their comfort. The same is true of the north of Ireland, where linen weaving has prevailed very generally in connexion with the management of small farms. Why not add other trades, for which the materials are on the spot, or might be easily procured? Exclusive guilds and trade combinations are among the legion of evil spirits which have possessed and tortured poor Ireland through a series of ages. Why not put an end to them for ever, by diffusing the trades over the country, so as to cheapen articles of clothing at home, and help to supply the American market? This would lessen the overwhelming supply of agricultural labour; would produce habits of neatness, order, cleanliness, and self-respect, and put an end to agrarian outrages. Then Irish emigration, too, would be of a different character, and exercise a far different influence on other countries.

We have not space to enumerate the trades which would be likely to prove most profitable in Ireland, if they were taught extensively in the national schools. We shall merely mention those connected with fishing, which might be taught in schools near the sea-coast. The Dutch fisherman is also a net-maker, a sail-maker, a fish-curer, a cooper. He has useful work for every season; whereas the Irish fisherman generally waits idly till the time of his work comes round, and then, perhaps, he has not his apparatus fit to go to sea, nor the means of making it so, though the fish should tempt him in shoals. Hence his family starve; and there is rarely any one to teach him any better mode of proceeding. Surely, then, this kind of education should not be neglected longer, now that Divine Providence seems interposing to change the habits of the people.

We cannot believe that this field would not richly repay the

culture. Of the vast undeveloped resources of Ireland there is no doubt; nor of the abundance of its native talent, which asks only to be trained and inspired with hope. The names of Shee, Mulready, Maclise, Hogan, Barry, and many others equally eminent in every department of the fine arts, are sufficient to prove that Ireland is not wanting in genius, even in those departments of art where, owing to unfortunate circumstances, she has been, as a nation, most deficient. There are now many auspicious indications that she is about to emerge from her difficulties and disadvantages, and to put forth her own strength freely in the path of improvement and prosperity.

CRITICISMS ON BOOKS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faber's Eight Dissertations. 2. Knollys Society Publications. 3. Modern British Plutarch. 4. Nelson's British Library. 5. Williams on Insanity. 6. Memoir of the Rev. S. Dyer. 7. Vinet's Essays and Discourses. 8. Bohn's Standard Library. 9. The Eternal. By Robert Philip. 10. Brown on the Second Advent. 11. The Divine Paupers. 12. Fleming on the Papacy. 13. Barnes on the Thessalonians, &c. 14. King on the Lord's Supper. 15. Stuart on the Canon of the Old Testament. 16. Garrett on Church Polity. 17. Wycliffe Society Publications. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Brook's Life of Cartwright. 19. Bonar on Leviticus. 20. Ephesus. By the Rev. P. P. P. Pounden. 21. Letters on Puritanism. Second Series. 22. The Jesuits. By R. W. Overbury. 23. The Solar System. 24. Dr. Payne's Lectures. Third Edition. 25. The Christian Treasury. 26. The Herald of the Churches. 27. Dr. Burton's Lectures. 28. Oughton's Sermon. 29. Binney's Two Discourses. 30. Sedgwick on Christian Fellowship. 31. Watson's Hill of Zion. 32. Glendearg Cottage. 33. Traditions of the Covenanters. 34. Bell's Life of Canning. |
|---|--|

1. *Eight Dissertations on certain connected Prophetical Passages of Holy Scripture, bearing more or less on the Promise of a Mighty Deliverer.*
By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 447, 392. Seeley,
London. 1845.

These eight dissertations are on the following subjects:—The Promised Seed of the Woman; The Prophecy of Noah; The Sceptre and Law-giver of Judah; The Star and Sceptre of Jacob; The Long-tarrying of the Children of Israel; The Desire of all Nations and the Delight of the Jews; The Universal Expectation of a Mighty Prince; The Predicted Final Triumph of Christ's Church over all Opposition and over every Apostasy. Mr. Faber has been long known as a writer who has brought large stores of learning to the illustration of his views on the subject of prophecy. His theories on that subject, as well as upon the origin of idolatry, are often more ingenious than accurate; but even when his theory is unsound, the material which he brings to it is often deeply interesting and of solid worth. He is an author, in consequence, who may always be read with advantage. The first six of these dissertations were written nearly thirty years since; but the two remaining, and a considerable body of notes included in these volumes, are of a more recent date. The aim of the writer in the whole series is to give a consistent view of the development of the divine purposes towards the human race from the beginning, and to indicate the character of the events expected to take place before the restitution of all things. Had Mr. Faber employed his learning as a defender of Revelation, rather than as an expositor of Prophecy, he might have been one of the most useful writers of his time. Even now, it is in this respect that his works are chiefly valuable.

- II. *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution.* 1614—1661. Edited for the Hanserd Knollys Society, with an Historical Introduction, by EDWARD BEAN UNDERHILL. 8vo, pp. cxxi. 401. Printed for the Society by J. Haddon, Castle Street, Finsbury, London. 1846.

The object of this Society is, 'to reprint, by an annual subscription of ten shillings and sixpence, all or such of the works of the early English or other baptists as the council shall decide. The series will include the works of both General and Particular Baptists; Records and Manuscripts relating to the rise and formation of the Baptist churches; Translations of such works as may illustrate the sufferings of the Baptists and the extension of their principles, together with such documents as are to be found only in large historical collections, or may not yet have appeared in an accessible form. On the baptismal controversy only those treatises will be given, which are of acknowledged worth or historic value. The whole will be accompanied with biographical notices of the authors, and with such notes and illustrations as may be essential to their completeness. The publications will consist of works produced before the close of the seventeenth century.' The following are the contents of the present volume. I. Historical Introduction. II. Religious Peace, a Plea for Conscience. III. Persecution for Religion judged and condemned. IV. An Humble Supplication to his Majesty. V. The Necessity of Toleration. VI. An Humble Petition and Representation of the Anabaptists. VII. A Plea for Toleration. VIII. Sion's Groans for her distressed. The earliest of these pieces is dated 1614. We doubt the correctness of one or two material historical statements made by the editor, but in nearly all respects he has acquitted himself in a manner which entitles him to much commendation. We wish the Council of the Knollys Society all success in their very laudable enterprise.

- III. *The Modern British Plutarch, or the Lives of Men distinguished in the recent history of our country, for their Talents, Virtue, or Achievements.* By W. C. TAYLOR, LL.D. 8vo, pp. 405. Grant and Griffith, London. 1846.

'Intelligent young persons,' says Dr. Taylor, 'hear names, 'familiar' as 'household words' to their parents, but of which they themselves know nothing. It is sometimes forgotten that the eminent men who have departed from the stage of life within our memory, though they cease not to be contemporaries for us, have become historical personages to our children, and that they require to be informed of all that we remember.' This new Plutarch is intended, in a measure, to supply this want. It includes sketches of the character and achievements of nearly forty of the most distinguished men in English history during the past century, beginning with Arkwright and Burke, and ending with Sir David Wilkie and the Duke of Wellington. In describing the career of statesmen (Dr. Taylor) has been careful to abstain from any manifestation of political bias or party feeling, and has therefore avoided giving any opinion on questions that yet remain within the arena of controversy. He has been more anxious to set forth facts as an arranger than to set himself up as a dictator to the judgment, or even a guide to opinion.' This was a difficult course to pursue; but the tact of the author has been upon the whole equal to the exigency; and the ability with which Dr. Taylor can compress the material of a subject has enabled him to produce a book which will be welcomed in any circle of intelligent young persons to which it may be introduced.

IV. *Nelson's British Library of Tracts for the People.* Part I. 12mo. Nelson, London and Edinburgh.

We cannot give a better account of the design of this series of 'Tracts for the People' than is contained in the following statement :—

'Prospectus :—Strictly religious and partly periodicals have long abounded, and strictly literary ones, that studiously avoid all acknowledgment of the fundamental principles of the Christian faith, are no less common; but ample room yet remains for one which, while it acknowledges the religion of the Bible as the highest embodiment of truth, shall fearlessly range, under its guidance, through all the abundant stores of knowledge for the instruction and amusement of the people. To occupy this ground is the object of the proposed series.

* Original contributions from many eminent writers in the varied departments of science and literature are now preparing for the Tracts for the People, as well as a series of Original Tales.

* The work will also be enriched with translations from the German, French, Swedish, and Italian, and will embrace every branch of useful knowledge and every subject calculated for instruction or rational amusement.'

Each tract contains thirty-two neatly printed pages, with a wood engraving. The tracts are published weekly, at one penny each, or in monthly parts, at fivepence each; and may be obtained weekly or monthly through any bookseller. The contents of the part before us are—I. The Dawn of the Reformation; or, Reformers before Luther. II. Reason and Instinct. III. The Lost Sister of Wyoming, by the Rev. J. Todd. IV. The Homes of our Fatherland, by Mrs. Sherwood. It is a publication which unites cheapness with goodness in a degree not surpassed by anything of the kind in this age of such effort.

V. *An Essay on the Use of Narcotics and other remedial agents, calculated to produce Sleep in the Treatment of Insanity.* By JOSEPH WILLIAMS, M.D. 8vo, pp. 120. Churchill, London. 1845.

When we state that this essay obtained the prize offered by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and awarded by the President and Fellows of King and Queen's College of Physicians, we need say no more to commend the work to medical practitioners, or to our readers generally.

VI. *Memoir of the Rev. Samuel Dyer, sixteen years Missionary to the Chinese.* By EVAN DAVIES. 12mo, pp. 300. Snow, London. 1846

The subject of this memoir was a person of great worth, and possessed eminent qualifications for his special work, but was removed from his field of enterprise in the midst of his days. This volume consists, for the greater part, of letters and documents relating to the deceased; and by all who knew Mr. Dyer, and by many in that large class of persons who sympathise with missionary devotedness, it will be read with interest. His name is entitled to a place among the foremost of the men whom the London Missionary Society has been honoured to sustain in such apostolic enterprise.

VII. *Vital Christianity: Essays and Discourses on the Religion of Man and the Religion of God.* By ALEXANDER VINET, D.D. Translated, with an Introduction, by ROBERT TURNBULL. 8vo, pp. 318. Clarke, Edinburgh. 1846.

These discourses are from the pen of a profound thinker and an eloquent writer. They are, in short, discourses for the age, placing the pulpit on a level with the most elevated thought and feeling of our time. They are 'addressed particularly,' to use the words of the translator, 'to that large class of cultivated minds who have some prepossession in favour of Christianity,

‘but who, from the influence of latent scepticism, do not yield their hearts to its direction and control.’ And truly they are appeals of a sort greatly needed. We urge our preachers, both young and old, not only to read, but to study them.

VIII. *Bohn's Standard Library.*

1. *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature.* By AUGUSTUS WILLIAM SCHLEGEL. 1 vol.
2. *The Life of Lorenzo de' Medici.* By WILLIAM ROSCOE. 1 vol.
3. *Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe.* By J. C. L. SIMONDE DE SISMONDI. 2 vols.

Of the merit of these publications we need not speak. They are such as should have a place in the library of every reading man in the kingdom—combining, as they do, erudition, taste, and eloquence, in an extraordinary degree. These three volumes contain revised editions of works originally published in eight octavos, and sold for about ten times their present price!

IX. *The Eternal, or the Attributes of Jehovah contemplated in Christ and Creation.* By ROBERT PHILIP. 12mo, pp. 270. Ward and Co., London. 1846.

The author of this volume is so well known to the religious public, that any attempt on our part to characterize or commend a publication from his pen must be unnecessary. The ease with which Mr. Philip disentangles the substance of his thoughts, and the idiomatic point of the style in which he presents his ideas, must have been felt by every one who has read only a small portion of his writings. Take the following as a specimen:—

‘You feel that this is nothing but sober fact, if you only suppose for a moment that God were not love. Why a cold *chill* comes over the spirit at once, when it glances at the bare idea of a *loveless* God! We feel, instinctively, that by no effort could we love such a being, whatever might be the consequences. We feel, too, that this would be felt in all worlds, and that it would be in vain to tell them or us to take pleasure or place confidence in a God without love. True, indeed, many take no pleasure in the fact that God is love. His wisdom or power as displayed in creation or his goodness in Providence, are far more attractive to them than his love. But were he not love in any sense, a change as well as a chill would soon come over their spirit. They are calm and cold because they take for granted that God is love in some sense, but they would shake with terror did they not so. Thus the very *ease* of the public mind, or its freedom from dark suspicions about the heart of God, proves, when closely examined, that the heart of man takes refuge from fear in some form or fragment of the great scriptural truth, that God is love.’—*I*p. 4, 5.

Now here is a book on the Divine Attributes full of thinking and of expression of this order,—adapted to awaken and stimulate the mind even of the least educated, and to furnish large materials for reflection to the most educated. It is, in our judgment, the best book produced by its author.

X. *Christ's Second Coming. Will it be Pre-Millennial?* By the REV. DAVID BROWN, A.M. Glasgow. 12mo, pp. 386. Johnstone, Edinburgh. 1846.

This is a publication opposed to the fanatical dreaming of modern Millenarianism. Its intelligent author thus sums up a large portion of his argument:—

‘We have seen that Christ's kingdom is just the kingdom of *grace* in the hands of the Mediator, a kingdom already in existence: virtually, ever since the Fall; formally, since his ascension to the right-hand of power. We have seen that all that is expected to distinguish the Millennial state of the kingdom from any state it has hitherto been in, so as to constitute it a new dispensation, is unsupported by the Word of God, and contrary to it; that a metropolitan temple, with corresponding ritual services at Jerusalem and revival of Jewish institutions, is a dream; and that the new state men are expected to be in as regards salvation, the open vision they are to enjoy, the absence of all those difficulties with which

we have to struggle on our way to heaven, and the total cessation of satanic influence over or in them; that these have not only no support, but are opposed to the whole teaching of Scripture; and, if true, would make not only a new dispensation, but a new Christianity:—pp. 313, 314.

This passage will suffice to indicate the sound drift of the work. It is a book which must have been the result of considerable reading, reflection, and labour, and we commend it earnestly to all persons who are desirous of obtaining sober and trustworthy counsel on the topic which it discusses.

- XI. *The Divine Panoply, or a Suit of Armour for the Soldier of Christ. With an Introduction*, by the REV. HUGH STOWELL, M.A. 12mo, pp. 278. Tract Society, 1846.

This is in every respect a beautiful book. The paper, printing, engraving, and binding, are all in a high style of taste and elegance. The engravings are twelve in number, representing the different portions of ancient armour. Each engraving is followed by historical notices relating to the piece of armour represented in it, and by sections under the title of Scriptural Illustration and Doctrinal Instruction.

- XII. *The Rise and Fall of Papacy*. By the REV. ROBERT FLEMING, jun. Edited, with a *Memoir of the Author*, by the REV. THOMAS THOMPSON. 12mo, pp. 127. Johnstone, Edinburgh. 1846.

Robert Fleming, the author of this dissertation, became the minister of the Presbyterian Church, Lothbury, London, in 1698, and died in 1716. He was a man of fair ability, and his learning was extensive; but he shared largely in the fears then entertained as to the fate of Protestantism, in consequence of the power exercised over European politics by France and Austria. Subsequent to the outbreak of the French Revolution, this treatise attracted considerable attention, its predictions as to the fall of the French Monarchy having been realized after the lapse of a century, in a manner which was regarded as bespeaking extraordinary sagacity on the part of the writer. But a man who could write after the following fashion must surely have been a person of much more reading than judgment.

‘One thing only I shall further take notice of here, upon the occasion of the King of Spain’s death, that God seems to mark out great things sometimes by very minute ones, such as names—for example, as the Spanish monarchy begun with Charles V. (as to the Austrian family), so it has now expired in one of the same name, which I the rather observe, because of many instances of the same kind, of which I number take these following: Darius, the Mede, as Daniel calls him (though Xenophon calls him Cyaxares), the uncle of Cyrus, was the first Medo-Persian monarch after the destruction of the Babylonian, and Darius Codomanus was the last. Ptolemy Soter began the Egyptian kingdom after Alexander’s death, and Ptolemy Dionysius was the last of that race. Augustus fixed the Roman empire, and it ended in Augustulus. The Eastern Roman Empire was erected by Constantine the Great, and expired with Constantine Palæologus. The Scots race came into England in a James, and has gone out again in another of that name. And whether William, the third King of England of that name, as well as the third William, Prince of Orange, be likely to be the last, both these ways is left to future time to unriddle.’—Pp. 53, 54.

Nevertheless, the man who could suppose the Divine government to be carried on upon this acrostic and cabalistic principle, has been honoured by some people as a great seer!

- XIII. *Notes Explanatory and Practical on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians to Titus, and to Philemon*. By ALBERT BARNES. Reprinted verbatim from the American Edition. 12mo, pp. 390. Aylott and Jones, London. 1846.

One of the best publications of its kind, and one of the cheapest. Every page bears the impress of learning, judgment, and piety.

XIV. *The Lord's Supper.* By the Rev. DAVID KING, LL.D. Glasgow. 12mo, pp. 296. Johnstone, Edinburgh. 1846.

A truly valuable work. We know not a better book to place in the hands of a candidate for communion, or in the hands of that large class of persons who, while communing often, greatly need assistance to enable them, to engage in that service with the required intelligence and feeling. It is learned and instructive, and at the same time popular and devotional.

XV. *Critical History in Defence of the Old Testament Canon.* By M. STUART, Andover, Mass. 8vo, pp. 452. Andover. 1845.

This is a much better book on the canon of the Old Testament than has issued from our own press. Jameison and Graves on the Pentateuch are valuable treatises so far as they extend, and were creditable to the ability of their authors at the time when they were written. But they embrace only a portion of the Old Testament, and the ordeal to which the claims of Moses and the prophets have been subjected at the hands of our German rationalists since that time, has rendered a new and enlarged discussion of the whole subject indispensable. Professor Stuart is highly competent to this piece of service; and if he has not done all that the condition of the question might be thought to demand, he has produced a book of real worth, and one which the great majority even of inquisitive readers will account as sufficient for its purpose.

XVI. *An Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church.* By WILLIAM ALBION GARRETT, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. 8vo, pp. 420. Seeley, London. 1846.

Mr. Garrett divides his inquiry into two parts. The first is described as embracing the scriptural view of the constitution of a church, and its relation to the Church Universal: the second consists of an examination of 'the evidence of the alleged fact of apostolical succession.' The writer is no believer in the said succession, nor in many other figments which have affinity with it. But he holds to the three orders, and to the principle of a national church establishment. His theory of Christian discipline is deduced from the Scriptures, and harmonizes little with the maxims of his own practice. His chapter on schism is not unsound; but, as is common with churchmen, fails to bring out the most material point necessary to a right understanding of the question. So in regard to the principle of church establishments, it is, no doubt, the duty of all rulers to become Christians, and thus to show themselves friends to Christianity. But what is there in the letter or spirit of Christianity to require them to judge and rule in respect to what is Christian while they themselves are not Christians? We might occupy a large space in discussing these topics. But, though we cannot adopt some of Mr. Garrett's conclusions, he is entitled to much praise for the dispassionateness and candour with which he has conducted his argument.

XVII. 1. *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe, D.D., with Selections and Translations from his Manuscripts and Latin Works.* Edited for the Wycliffe Society, with an Introductory Memoir, by the Rev. ROBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. 8vo, pp. xciv. 392.

2. *Select Works of the Rev. and Learned David Clarkson, B.D., and sometime Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge.* Edited for the Wycliffe Society, by the Rev. BASIL H. COOPER, B.A., with Historical Notices of the Life and Writings of the Author, by the Rev. JOHN BLACKBURN. Printed for the Society by Blackburn and Pardon, London. 8vo, pp. xlv. 500.

The Wycliffe Society is formed by Congregationalists, for the purpose of securing the republication of the most curious and valuable tracts and treatises

bearing upon those ecclesiastical controversies in our history with which the principles of Congregationalism are more or less interwoven. Its plan has been to supply three volumes a-year to subscribers of one guinea per annum. In such projects success depends very much upon faith and promptitude. The conductors of such an enterprise should lose no time in making it clear that subscribers to it will receive their money's worth, and something more. This is one of those objects in which wise men must not wait for the public feeling, but go before it, and teach it.

The first publication in this series contains a brief Memoir of Wycliffe, a reprint of all that had been previously printed of his works, and a fuller and more authentic account of the writings of the great Reformer than will be found in any other extant volume. The works printed in the second volume are learned and able productions, and have been edited with much care; were these treatises read deliberately by the majority of our educated laymen, and even by the majority of our ministers, some very important people would begin to see how little they really know about the history of their own principles. We have only one complaint to make against this second volume, which is, that it should have been the tenth of the series rather than the second. One of the great charms of such a library would be that each volume should have its place chronologically, the last of the number belonging to the latest time. This rule is, we understand, to be more observed in future—the treatises to form the third volume being selected from the sixteenth or the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Congregationalists must remember that in such publications they are not to expect light reading—tales after the Scotch novel manner. The documents to be published are the memorials of men who lived, the life of confessors and martyrs; and if the majesty of principle, and the majesty of a struggle maintained so long, and against such odds, in the cause of principle, has not a power in it to interest us, why then—well, what then?—why, then, we should greatly prefer leaving the parties concerned in such a disgrace to finish this sentence for themselves.

XVIII. *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright, B.D., including the Principal Ecclesiastical Movements in the Reign of Elizabeth.* By the REV. B. BROOK, author of 'The Lives of the Puritans.' 8vo, pp. 491. Snow, London. 1845.

This work was published last year, and we abstained from any reference to it on its appearance, in the hope of finding occasion to bestow something like adequate attention on a subject so interesting and instructive as the 'Life and Writings' of Cartwright. This we shall hope to do, but in the meanwhile we feel it to be due to the author of this publication to apprise our readers of its existence, and to commend it to their perusal. The style of Mr. Brook has a pulpit diffuseness and repetition in it which is unfavourable to his success as an author; and he sees the events of past times too much as a man of our own time; but deficient as he may be in the art of compression, and in large philosophical views of men and affairs, he is a laborious, truthful man, and has produced a book from which any intelligent reader may form a just estimate both of the character and writings of the subject of his memoir.

XIX. *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus, Expository and Practical, with Critical Notes.* By the REV. ANDREW A. BONAR. 8vo, pp. 488. Nisbet, London. 1846.

Mr. Romaine was so fond of identifying evangelical truth with everything belonging to the Old Testament dispensation, that he sometimes spoke of the

Book of Leviticus as the Gospel according to Leviticus. Mr. Bonar has written a commentary on Leviticus upon this principle, and in this spirit. So far as the New Testament becomes the expositor of the Old, we feel safe in adopting such a course of interpretation; but when men proceed beyond this inspired guidance, and begin to teach that minute ceremonies should be regarded as having an evangelical meaning, because they see, or think they see, that there is some resemblance between such ceremonies and such meanings, we feel that the reins have dropped from the guidance of the judgment to that of the imagination. This is not to search for *truth*, but for *resemblances* and *analogies*. Mr. Bonar has brought learning to his task, and he makes the Levitical ceremonies to be preachers of sound evangelical doctrine; but he errs, in our judgment, in carrying his principle of evangelical interpretation so far as he has done. It is not necessary that every part of the Levitical ritual should have a meaning to *us*, it is sufficient that it had a meaning to the people who were required to be observers of it. ●

XX. *Ephesus; or, the Church's Precedent in Doctrine and Discipline.* By the REV. P. POUNDEN, A.M., Vicar of Westport, diocese of Tuam. 12mo, pp. 322. Seeley, London. 1846.

There is some ingenuity in the plan of this treatise, but on looking into it we have not found the promise given in the table of contents fulfilled in the performance. The titles of some of its sections are—'The Church's Constitution—the Church's Ministry—the Membership of the Church,' &c. But on turning to those sections, we find them singularly wanting in the kind of matter we expected to meet with. In Ireland, it seems, there are parties who have seceded from the Established Church, renouncing Baptism and the Lord's Supper, an ordained ministry, and a visible church in any form, and the object of Mr. Pounden in this publication is to refute the dogmas of such persons. From this cause the book has little adaptation to English readers; and the disposition of the writer to reason from metaphors and analogies, rather than from facts and principles, gives a sad looseness and pointlessness to his arguments.

XXI. *Letters on Puritanism and Nonconformity.* By SIR J. B. WILLIAMS, KNT., LL.D., F.S.A., and Member of the American Antiquarian Society. 12mo, pp. 271. Jackson and Walford, London. 1846.

There are many minds susceptible of a far greater benefit from brief memoirs of departed wisdom or piety than from compositions of any other description. This second series of Letters by Sir John Bickerton Williams, on the character and history of our Nonconformist fathers, will, we doubt not, be acceptable to a large class of readers. The urbanity, candour, and piety of the author, allied as these qualities are with a firm attachment to his principles as a descendant of the Howes and Henrys of other days, impart a charm to his narrative which is only of too rare an occurrence when such topics are discussed. The book is one of a class which pious Nonconformists should be careful to place in the hands of their children. It shows that Nonconformity has its line of 'succession,' its association in history with everything venerable in learning and brilliant in genius, with everything noble in moral heroism and enlightened in religious principle.

XXII. *The Jesuits.* By R. W. OVERBURY. 12mo, pp. 260. Houlston, London. 1846.

Mr. Overbury informs us that his attention was called to the subject on which he discourses in this volume, by two articles which appeared some time

since in the 'Edinburgh Review,' on Ignatius Loyola and Xavier. In those articles, the writer is said to have kept 'the foibles and vicious qualities' of his heroes in the back-ground; and the present work is meant to supply the reviewer's lack of service in that particular. Mr. Overbury is not singular in holding such views of the said articles; and if we could only unite something more of the philosophy and charity of the reviewer, with the fuller truth of the Baptist minister, we should, perhaps, make a near approach towards a just estimation of the character of the 'Jesuits.'

XXIII. *The Solar System.* Monthly Series. Tract Society.

This first part of an intended treatise on Astronomy, describes 'the General Aspect and the Apparent Motions of the Heavens—the Figure and Motion of the Earth—and the Bodies connected with the Solar System.' The writer appears to be well acquainted with his subject, and has placed a large amount of information in a small space. Engravings accompany the different descriptions.

XXIV. *Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, Election, the Atonement, Justification, and Regeneration, to which are appended Strictures upon Recent Publications by Dr. Marshall and Mr. Huldane, on the Atonement; and upon the Statements of Dr. Jenkyn on the Influences of the Holy Spirit.* By GEORGE PAYNE, LL.D. Third Edition, enlarged. 8vo, pp. 454. Gladding, London. 1846.

This volume is a standard book in English Theology, and is justly entitled to the place thus assigned to it. We confide in the judgment of Dr. Payne, upon the whole, as largely as in that of any living theologian. We have sometimes wished that his reading in theology, and upon other subjects, had been less restricted than it appears to have been; but he never commits himself upon any matter that he does not thoroughly understand, and his reasoning always evinces great acuteness and discrimination. It is true he is sometimes more happy in detecting flaws and discrepancies than in constructing the better thing which should come into their place, but he is often equally felicitous in the detection of error and in the elucidation of truth.

In the present edition of his *Lectures* there is a note of some thirty pages on the 'Influences of the Holy Spirit.' It consists of an examination of the theory of Dr. Jenkyn on the 'Work of the Spirit.' Every one who has read Dr. Jenkyn's book must feel that he is good at portions and points of his subject, but we never read a work in which we found it so difficult to discover the main point. The errors which he opposes are for the most part real, some preposterous as to be hardly worth an attempt at refutation; but the substance of the work leaves no place for Divine influence at all, in the received view of it, and the few passages which seem to express a different meaning, are either so ambiguous, or so strongly opposed to the general statements of the volume, that we must confess our inability to say what the doctrine really is which the writer has intended to set forth. We are willing to hope that our friend's views on this most material truth are not so diverse from the views of our Owens and Howes as many seem to conclude, and shall be much gratified if the calm and candid critique of Dr. Payne should call forth such more coherent and clearer statements from Dr. Jenkyn as may put an end to all misgivings.

XXV. *The Christian Treasury:* containing Contributions from Ministers and Members of various Evangelical Denominations. 8vo. Johnstone, Edinburgh. Vol. I. 1846.

This periodical is designed to furnish the best Christian literature at the smallest possible cost. Some of our oldest and ablest writers in the different

religious denominations of England and Scotland are among its contributors. The work is published in weekly numbers of one penny each, and in monthly parts. It is edited with judgment, and presents a combination of learning, science, talent, and piety, which cannot fail of doing important service.

XXVI. *The Herald of the Churches.*

This is a monthly publication, supplying a digest of intelligence respecting the labours of missionaries, and the proceedings of all Protestant missionary societies. Its conductors appear to have access to the best sources of information, and are mindful of their pledged superiority to all sectarian partiality.

XXVII. *Lectures on the Deluge, and the World after the Flood.* By the Rev. CHARLES BURTON, LL.D. F.L.S., &c. 8vo., pp. 372. Hamilton, London. 1846.

Dr. Burton is a laborious clergyman, and one who aims to give diversity to an evangelical ministry by lectures of this description, which bring science and learning into something more than their usual subservience to the duties of the pulpit. We regard such effort, when made by men competent to it, as deserving of commendation. To a great majority of Dr. Burton's hearers there must have been much in every lecture of this series that would be new and instructive. We do not, of course, pledge ourselves to all that is contained in this volume; but these discourses are of a kind that must be more frequently heard from the pulpit, if the pulpit is to meet the demands of the coming times. The chief fault in Dr. Burton's publications is in their titles—they promise too much.

XXVIII. *The Church's Lamentation over Departed Greatness. A Sermon on the Death of the Rev. William Knib.* By the Rev. SAMUEL OUGHTON. Kingston, Jamaica. 3vo, pp. 39. Snow, London. 1846.

In this discourse, Mr. Oughton does full justice to the eminent qualities of Mr. Knib; but has ventured to intimate that the deceased had his imperfections, and has proceeded so far as to specify some of them. Such, it seems, has been Mr. Oughton's custom when preaching funeral sermons. But in this instance, his notion of fidelity brought upon him loud censure, and the discourse before us is published in self-defence, that there may be no more mistake as to the 'front of his offending' in this respect. For our own part, supposing his statements to be true, we must honour his integrity. The want of more discrimination in our estimate of our great men, is one reason why non-conformist literature is so little read beyond the circle of nonconformists. When we attempt to sketch character, men of sense expect the whole character, not a piece of it.

XXIX. *The Spirit admitted to the Heavenly House; the Body refused a Grave. Two Sermons, preached on the occasion of the Death of the Rev. T. S. Gyer, of Ryde, Isle of Wight.* By THOMAS BINNEY. 8vo, pp. 104. Jackson and Walford, London. 1846.

Some months since, the Rev. T. S. Gyer, independent minister of Ryde, in the Isle of Wight, entered into his rest. Few men have lived and died so much esteemed and beloved, in their religious connexion or in general society. And the man was worthy whom other men thus regarded—an intelligent, devout, laborious, self-denying, peaceful man. But though all men felt that the spirit of Mr. Gyer had assuredly been admitted to the 'Heavenly House,' the clergyman of the church where a place of internment was sought

for his body, refused it a grave! Two children of the deceased were buried there, and every feeling pointed to that spot as the place where the ashes of the parent should sleep also; but this availed nothing. The church did not happen to be Mr. Gyer's parish church: in that case, the law of the land, according to the version of the clergyman, did not interpose to compel him to allow the body a sepulchre, and the law of the church forbid his doing so. The rev. gentleman spoke of pursuing this course with reluctance and pain, especially in the instance of a person otherwise so estimable as the deceased; but the relation in which Mr. Gyer stood to the church of England was such as to preclude him from church burial, according to the law of the church.

But we must say that we cannot give this Rev. P. Hewitt, rector of Binstead, the slightest credit for sincerity in this talk about sorrow and conscientiousness. By this grimace, he has only added hypocrisy to bigotry—in the manner of the men who when they tortured flesh in a dungeon, or gave the body to be burned, did always, as matter of course, profess to do so with sorrow and reluctance. According to his own showing, this man is a miserable earthling, so pliant in conscience when it suits him, that he is ready to violate that law of his God as often as the law of his church shall require him to do so—to sin against his God being a much less evil than to forfeit his temporalities by sinning against Caesar. If it be the *man* who is at fault here, he should be denounced as a delinquent; if it be the *church*, it surely is time she should amend.

In the first of these discourses, Mr. Binney has published an able exposition of an interesting scripture, and has described the character of Mr. Gyer as he knew it to be: in the second, he has dealt a hard blow against those episcopal pretensions which are the natural root of these displays of priestly intolerance.

XXX. *The Wine of the Kingdom, or Fellowship with Christ.* By the Rev. ROBERT SEDGWICK. Aberdeen. 24mo, pp. 155. H. Hamilton, London. 1846.

This is a book written under the impression, now a very common one, that with regard to religion, 'the former times were better than these.' This impression may be in part just, but we believe it to be in great part unjust. The piety of the few, subject to persecution in other days, may have been more fervent than the piety of the many who now know nothing of such fiery trials; but we are well persuaded of two things—that society in this country never included so large an amount of enlightened religious feeling as at this hour, and that society at large has never been compelled by the force of Christian principle to demean itself on the whole so respectfully towards the claims of such principle. The piety of our times is more active than contemplative; this is the great difference between the past and the present, and the book published by Mr. Sedgwick is well adapted to check the danger naturally attendant on the change in this respect which has been for some time taking place among us.

XXXI. *Hill of Zion, or the First and Last Things Illustrative of the Present Dispensation.* By the Rev. THOMAS WATSON, M.A., Minister of St. Philip's, Granville Square. Nisbet, London. 1846.

An exposition of Calvinistic doctrine, scriptural in its substance, and devotional in its tendency.

XXXII. *Glendearg Cottage. A Tale concerning Church Principles.* By Miss CHRISTMAS. Smith, Elder & Co. 1846.

Glendearg Cottage is a religious tale, designed to teach young people that

dissent is synonymous with a vulgar bigotry, and that church principles are the only road to genteel piety. It is a book honoured with a preface from the pen of the brother of the authoress, the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A., F.R.S., F.S.A., who dates his commendation from 'Sion College, London Wall.' But the production is as devoid of ability as of honesty, and may be safely left to its fate.

XXXIII. *Traditions of the Covenanters.* By the REV. ROBERT SIMPSON. Johnstone, Edinburgh. 1846.

'The sources of these traditions,' says the author of this volume, 'are chiefly the descendants of the persons themselves to whom the incidents refer. They have been retained as heirlooms in the families of the worthy men who suffered so much in the cause of truth and righteousness. This circumstance affords a strong guarantee for the fidelity and correctness of the narratives as a whole, although some attendant circumstances may probably in the lapse of three generations have varied in the telling. The locality which it has attempted to glean is that chiefly in the midst of which Sanguhar is situated: it was not the design of the writer to compose tales founded on the incidents, but simply to present the tradition in its native simplicity and truth.'—Preface.

The book consists of more than four hundred and fifty closely printed pages, full of simple, devout, and affecting narrative, containing so much that is honourable to the persecuted, and dishonourable to their persecutors, that one wonders there should be a man in Scotland capable of looking back to those days without execrating the name of Stuart. Truly the prelacy of that time was a 'black' prelacy.

XXXIV. *The Life of the Right Honourable George Canning.* By ROBERT HALL. 8vo, pp. 368. Chapman and Hall. 1846.

This is a well-written and an interesting book, and presents, on the whole, a more trustworthy account of Canning than we have met with elsewhere. The writer is sufficiently favourable to the subject of his narrative, but on doubtful points leaves you tolerably free to form your own judgment from the materials of the case. The shady part of Canning's early history, his conversion from Whigism, and 'something more,' to the course of rabid Toryism to which he afterwards committed himself, remains much as it was, and leaves little for wonder that he should have found it so difficult to assert for himself a higher rank than that of 'political adventurer.' He was about the last of his race—a splendid tool, of which hereditary imbecility availed itself in a manner which will hardly admit of repetition in this country. We are far from wishing to see our government descend, as a sort of heirloom, in the hands of our 'great families,' but the best remedy for that evil is not that needy men should give themselves to statesmanship as a trade. The bait of office in such cases must be all but irresistible.

INDEX.

- Apostolical Fathers, by C. J. Hefele, 378;
 Editors, and translators of the, 379;
 Errors of the Fathers, by Osborne,
 Coneybeare, 380; Errors of Mr. Coney-
 beare, 381, 382; Dr. Bennett's theology
 of the fathers, 383; incorrect statements
 of the fathers, 384; their church prin-
 ciples, 385; Reeves's translation of their
 apologies, 386; Clement, 387; his his-
 tory, 388; Ignatius, 391; his martyr-
 dom by Trajan, 392; his epistles, 393;
 Polycarp, 394; his martyrdom, 395;
 Christianity rests not on the fathers, 396.
- Authority in religion, 38. See White.
- Barnes on the Thessalonians, &c., 545.
- Bell's Life of Canning, 552.
- Binney's Two Discourses, 550.
- Blanco White, 38. See White.
- Bohn's Standard Library, 544.
- Bonar on Leviticus, 547.
- Brook's Life of Cartwright, 547.
- Brown on the Second Advent, 544.
- Brownson's Quarterly Review, 38. See
 White.
- Burton's, Dr., Lectures, 550.
- Covenanters' Communion, 25. See His-
 toric Painting.
- Covenanters in the North of Scotland, by
 Robert King, 325; the Culdees with re-
 ligious establishments, 326; they dege-
 nerate, 327; inventories of Aberdeen
 cathedral, its worship, 327; character
 of its bishops, 328; attached to popery,
 329; decree of James V. against Re-
 formed doctrines, 329; their pre-
 valence, 330; corrupt state of Aber-
 deen, 331; efforts at reform, 332; decree
 of the citizens, 333; ecclesiastical
 changes, the covenant, 334; sickness
 and death of the author, 335; Alexan-
 der Jaffray, 336; his family and history,
 337; his public life, 338; his religious
 history, 339; unites with an inde-
 pendent church, 340; progress of pro-
 testant doctrine, 341; John Menzies
 and John Row, 342; statement of their
 principles, 343; state of the church,
 344; the Restoration, 345; conformity
 and death of Menzies, 346; character
 of Jaffray, almost a Quaker, 347; cove-
 nanters and Quakers suffer, 348; Jaf-
 fray's sufferings and death, 349.
- Croton Aqueduct, 427. See Supplies of
 Water.
- Education in England, 444; opinions re-
 garding, 445; how far carried, 446;
 government inquiry, 447; tables of re-
 ports, 448; Manchester Statistical So-
 ciety reports, 450; Salford and Bury,
 451; Liverpool, 452; York, Hull, Rut-
 land, 453; Report of Hon. and Rev. B.
 W. Noel, 454; Birmingham and other
 towns, 455; proportion in schools, 456;
 numbers not at school, 457; destitution,
 459; defective knowledge, 460; Bed-
 ford and Cambridge, 461; Midland
 counties, 462; proportion unable to
 read and write, 463; report of Rev. H.
 Moseley, 464; Mr. Noel on the com-
 mon school, 465; on National schools,
 468; on the religious training, 470;
 nature of his testimony, 471; mass of
 ignorance in England and Wales, 472;
 policy of the government, 474; re-
 quirements, 476; voluntary provision,
 479; fallacies, 480; efforts of the non-
 conformists, 482; congregational efforts,
 483; schools required, 484; state as-
 sistance, 486; state provision in the
 United States, 487; schools in Prussia,
 492; Dr. Vaughan's letter to the Cho-
 nicle, 493; his second letter, 496; re-
 sults of the argument, 502; duties of
 religious persons, 504; compulsory
 education, 506; reasoning of some phi-
 lanthropists, 508.
- Education in Ireland, reports of commis-
 sioners, Act of Henry VIII., 509; re-
 newed under William III., policy of
 the clergy, 510; policy of the bishops
 under George II., 511; incorporated
 society, 512; results, state of the
 schools, 513; miserable state of the
 Irish chartered and endowed schools,
 514; reports of commissioners of edu-
 cation, 515; character of the teaching,
 517; free and diocesan schools, 518;
 royal schools, 519; their abuse, 520;
 endowed schools, 521; association for
 promoting religion, Hibernian society,
 522; frauds in the schools, 523; pro-
 posed general education, 524; report of
 commissioners, 525; Kildare-place
 schools, 526; statement of Mr. Vevers,
 527; education commissioners, 528;
 the church education society, 529; re-
 port of commissioners, 530; progress
 of the schools, 532; policy of Dr.

- McHale, 534; former school books, 535; testimony of Baptist Irish Society, 536; number of the schools, 537; charter of incorporation, 539.
- Ephesus. By the Rev. P. P. Pousden, 548.
- Faber's Eight Dissertations, 541.
- Fleming on the Papacy, 545.
- Foreign Literary Intelligence:—Theology and philosophy, 277; classical literature, 278; history, geography, and general literature, 279; periodical literature, 282; universities, miscellaneous, and obituary, 283.
- Foster, John. Life and Correspondence of, by J. E. Ryland, with Notices of him, by John Sheppard, 197; born at Hebben Bridge, 198; his boyhood, 199; his early education, 200; piety of his father, 201; his religious studies, 202; his tutor, Fawcett, 203; his entrance to Bristol Baptist Academy, 204; editor of his biography, 205; French Revolution, 206; condition of dissenters, 207; Foster's entrance on the ministry, 208; his removal to Dublin, 209; his opinions, 210; his removal to Chichester, Battersea, and Downend, 211; he settles at Frome and Bourton, 212; his literary works, loss of friends, and death, 213; Foster compared with Robert Hall, 214; his intellectual power, 215, 216; his influence on literature, 218, 219; his friendship, 220; his notions of churches, 221; his peculiarities, 223; his confessions, 224; Foster and Hall compared, 225; Foster's views of the world, 226, 227; his recluse temperament, 228; mystery of the Deity, 229; Foster's peculiar notions, 230; his letters to Mr. Cottle, 231; future punishments, 232; Foster as a preacher, 233, 234; his personal appearance, 235; his manner, 236; his religious principles, 237; his style, 238, 239; compared with that of Robert Hall, 240; various style in teaching, 241; Foster and Hall compared, 242, 243; Foster's piety, 244; his letters, 245; his political opinions, 246; his enjoyment of natural scenery, 248; his estimate of cathedrals and the clergy, 249.
- Garrett on Church Polity, 546.
- Glendearg Cottage, 551.
- Henderson, E., D.D., Translation of the Minor Prophets, 419. See Minor Prophets.
- Historic painting, 251; the First Reading of the Bible in the Crypt of St. Paul's, by G. Harvey, 252; his self-education, 253; the Covenanters Preaching and the Battle of Drumclog, 254; the Covenanter's Communion, 255; subjects for painters, 256; Harvey's pictures—The Examination, Dismissal of the Village School, Reading of the Bible, 257; engraving of it, 258.
- Industrial History of Free Nations, 179; commercial companies, 180; trade monopolies, 181; right to property, 182; freedom of industry, 183; free states, Greece and Holland, 184; Grecian manufactures, 185; stimulus to improvement in trade, 186; Grecian genius, 188; Mr. McCullagh's estimate of the Greeks, 189; Athens, 190; historical notices of the Dutch, 191; Dutch colonies and commerce, 192; their industry, 193; superior to nobility, 194; ancient and modern world contrasted, 195; importance of various ranks in society, 196.
- King on the Lord's Supper, 546.
- King, Robert, 325. See Covenanters.
- Knollys Society Publication, 542.
- Letters on Puritanism. Second Series, 548.
- Logic, a System of, by J. S. Mill. See Mill's System of Logic.
- Mackintosh, Sir James, Works of, 285; his progress of opinion, 286; his *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, 287; Burke on the French Revolution, 288; opposed by Mackintosh, 289; his reasoning, 290; Arguments on the subject, 291; their force, 292; misrepresentations of him, 293; his History of the Revolution, 294; the Stuarts and religious parties, 295; James II. and his counsellors, 296; trial of Mrs. Lisle, 297; religion of James, and principles of his ministers; 298; policy of James, 299; imprisonment of the bishops, 300; their trial and acquittal, 301; foolish policy of the king, 302; union of parties, 303; their motives; 304; Sir James's partition of Poland, 305; authorship of "Icon Basilike," 306; character of Mr. Cunningham, 307; Sir James's Life of Sir Thomas More, and ethical philosophy, 309; various theories, 310, 312; defects of Sir James's theory, 313; theories of Germans and French, 314, 315; of Berkeley, Spinoza, and Kant, 316; metaphysics, 317; freedom of the will, 319; consciousness, 321; character of Mackintosh, 322; his accomplishments, 323; his writings, 324.
- McCullagh, W. Torrens, Industrial History of Free Nations, 179. See Industrial History.
- Memoir of the Rev. S. Dyer, 543.
- Mill's System of Logic, 1; his definition of it, 2; its results, 3; defects, 4; names, things, titles, 6, 7; propositions, 8; mode of clearly stating them, 10;

- theory of Hobbes, 11; verbal and real propositions, 12, 13; definitions of names and things, 14, 16; reasoning, inference, 17; induction and syllogism, 18; their application, 19; examples, 20, 21; false syllogisms, 23; induction or inference, 24, 25; inconsistencies of Mr. Mill, 26, 27; his failure regarding mathematics, 28, 30; intuition and observation, 31; necessary truths, 32; theory of induction, 33; mistake of Mr. Mill, 34; his use of Hume's argument against miracles, 36; masterly portions of Mr. Mill's book, 37.
- Ministry, the New, 259; Whigs, 260; Sir Robert Peel, 261; his motives, 262; Richard Cobden, 263; his public labours, 264; What will the Whigs do? 265; nonconformists have reason for anxiety, 266; church establishments and endowment of popery, 267; popular education, 268; Ought Government to educate the people, 269; questions of duty and policy, 270; Should Government grants be made to schools? 271; policy of the Whig ministers, 272; Dr. Hook's new plan of education, 273; his principles, 274; his progress of opinion, 275.
- Minor Prophets, New Translation of, 420; instances in Hosea, 420; Dr. Henderson's general preface, 423; double sense of prophecy, 424; typical persons and things, 425; application of Old Testament prophecies, 426.
- Modern British Plutarch, 542.
- Nelson's British Library, 543.
- Noble, Daniel, M.R.C.S., on the Brain, 397. See Phrenology.
- Oughton's Sermon, 550.
- Over-Population and its Remedy, 115; state of ancient population, 116; past condition of England, 117; over-population as contemplated by Malthus, 118; rejection of his notion, 120; Mr. Thornton's theory and statistics, 121; his definition deficient, 122; evidence and causes of over-population, 123; causes of increase and misery, 124; laws against extravagance, 125; poverty causes increase of population, 126; Mr. Thornton's remedies, 127; allotments to cottagers, 128; emigration, 129; condition of the English in the seventeenth century, 130; population in Scotland and Ireland compared with other countries, 131; misery the great promoter of over-population, 132; pauperism after Queen Anne, 133; policy of marriage, 134; doctrine of Malthus, 135; late marriage counselled by Thornton, 136; age of marriage in the nobility, 137; Irish increase of population, 138; policy of the poor-law, 139; distress and population-increase each other, 140.
- Payne's, Dr., Lectures. Third Edition, 549.
- Phrenology, Gall's system of, 398; Dr. Spurzheim and Mr. Combe, 399; facts of the case, 400; examination of them, 402; measurements of ten skulls, 404; analysis, 408; remarks on different skulls, 410; Haggart and Swift compared, 412; remarks of Mr. Noble, 414; contradiction by comparative anatomy, 416; difficulties of the system, 418.
- Poems, by Leigh Hunt, by John Keats; by Barry Cornwall, false hypothesis regarding poetry, 350; ages when poetry flourished, 351; Homer's Iliad and the Greeks, 352; Thespis, Æschylus, 353; Sophocles and his times, 354; Virgil, Horace, and Roman refinement, 355; Juvenal, and its corruptions, 356; poetry of the Provençals, Dante, Petrarca, and Chaucer, 357; poets of Spain and Portugal, 358; selfishness of the Greeks, 359; Chaucer the prototype of Milton, 360; Spenser, Shakspeare, 361; his literary talents, 362; the Commonwealth, Milton, 363; his varied talents, 364; Dryden, Thomson, 365; Cowper, Burns, 366; Southey, Coleridge, Campbell, 367; Byron and Shelley, 368; Moore, Crabbe, Montgomery, Rogers, Wordsworth, Hunt, 369; Keats, 370; Ode to a Nightingale, 371; Romance of London, 372; The Story, 373; London at Daybreak, 374; Wellington, 375; O'Connell, Stanley, 376; poetry in prospect, 377.
- Ryland, J. E., Life of Foster. See Foster.
- Sedgwick on Christian Fellowship, 551.
- Sheppard, John. See Foster.
- Spain, its modern state and fertility of the soil, 143; dangerous society in, 144; guides to travellers, 145; Ford's handbook, 146; his view of Spain, 148; Spanish inns, 149; their accommodations, 150, 151; Italian and gipsy innkeepers, 153; Spanish language, 154; the Basque language, 156; French tourists, 157; Capt. Cook, Poco Mas, and Mr. Hughes, 158; liberties of Hughes, 159; his mistakes and fraud, 160; Diego Leon, 161; Spanish army and secret societies, 162; Moderados and Progresistas, 163; Narvæz, 164; Martinez, Mon, 167; Pidal, Miraflores, 168; Burgos, 169; Isturiz, 170; miserable state of Spain, 171; Solis and Rubin, 172; marriage of the queen, 173; clergy of Spain, 174; cathedral

riches, 175; state of religion in Spain, 176; agriculture and manufactures in Spain, 177; Spanish literature and music, 178.

Straton, James, on Phrenology, 397. See Phrenology.

Stuart's Canon of the Old Testament, 546.

Supplies of water, 437; famous aqueducts of Rome and America, 438; desirable supply of water, 429; in town, 430; impurities, 432; irrigations, 434; plan of supply, 435; liquid manures, 436; analysis of sewer waters, 437; of the Medlock, 438; supplies in the North of England, 440; in Lancashire, 441; for Manchester and Liverpool, 442.

The Eternal. By Robert Philip, 544.

The Divine Panoply, 545.

The Jesuits. By R. W. Overbury, 548.

The Solar System, 549.

The Christian Treasury, 549.

The Herald of the Churches, 550.

Thorstein, Thomas William, 115. See Over-Population.

Traditions of the Covenanters, 552.

Viner's Essays and Discourses, 543.

Watson's Hill of Zion, 551.

White, Rev. J. B., Life of, 38; his autobiography and correspondence, 39; his birth and early education in Spain, 40; his appointment as chaplain at the Chapel Royal, and his infidelity, 41; he comes into England, 42; he obtains a pension from the English government, 43; he re-embraces Christianity, 44; he becomes a clergyman of the church of England, 44; his secret unbelief, 45; he associates with the evangelical class, 46; his experience, 47; he engages as tutor to Lord Holland's son, 47; his literary works, 48; his scepticism, 48; his views of the priesthood, 49; he inclines to unitarianism,

his correspondence, 50; he follows the German infidels, 51; his state of mind as he grew old, 52; his bitterness of spirit, 53; his mental condition, 54; his notions of right and wrong, 56; causes of his scepticism and mental misery, 57, 58; Brownson's speculations, 59; his regard to the foundation of faith, 60; modes of divine revelation, 61; its evidences, 62, 63; groundless claims of the Romish church, 64, 65; claims of the Scriptures, 66, 67; no human infallible interpreter, 68; testimony of Scripture against errors, 69; defective views of truth, 70; causes of error, 71; truth and the apprehension of it, 72; Romish pretensions, 73; plainness of divine revelation, 74, 75; character of its inspiration, 76; mode of interpreting Scripture, 77; essential harmony of real Christians, 78; sources of the errors of Blanco White, 79, 80.

Williams on Insanity, 543.

Wollaston, Dr., one of the ablest of modern chemists, 81; his life and character, 82; his education at Cambridge, and practice as physician, 83; his discoveries as a chemist, 84; his papers on astronomy, 85, 86; merits of them, 87; his useful inventions, 88, 89; platina, its history, 90; its value, 91; crystals, gems, 92; Dr. Wollaston's goniometer, 93; crystallization, 94; its laws, 95; fairy rings, 97; their cause, 98; direction of the eyes in a portrait, 99; on sounds inaudible to certain ears, 100; Wollaston's illness and preparation for death, 101; elected a member of the Astronomical Society, 102; manner of his death, 103; anecdotes of him, 104; his increase of property, 105; an act of his generosity, 106; comparison of him with Sir H. Davy, 107; his discoveries, 110, 112; his character, 113.

Wycliffe Society Publications, 546.

